17463

NATIONAL LIBRARY
OTTAWA

CANADA

BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE
OTTAWA

NAME OF AUTHOR KENNETH WILBERT BRIDE

TITLE OF THESIS A STUDY OF PRESTIGE AND
ATTITUDE DIFFERENTIALS
AMONG PRACTICING ALBERTA TEACHERS

UNIVERSITY ALBERTA.

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED PH. D

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED 1973

Permission is hereby granted to THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(Signed) K. W. Bride

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

9011 - 142 ST
EDMONTON
ALBERTA

DATED July 11 1973

NL-91 (10-68)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

A STUDY OF PRESTIGE AND ATTITUDE DIFFERENTIALS AMONG PRACTICING ALBERTA TEACHERS

by

Ⓒ KENNETH WILBERT BRIDE

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA
FALL, 1973

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled "A Study of Prestige and Attitude Differentials Among Practicing Alberta Teachers", submitted by Kenneth Wilbert Bride in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

E. Miklos
Supervisor

Eu Ratsoy

R. G. McIntosh

R. S. Pannu

J. W. Peach
External Examiner

Date . June 21, 1973

ABSTRACT

This study employed an intra-occupational approach designed to investigate the nature and extent of hierarchical stratification presently existing within the teaching profession. It was concerned with the identification and description of prestige hierarchies classified on the basis of selected positional, professional and personal characteristics and structured according to perceived measures of prestige provided by a sample of 1069 Alberta teachers. For comparison purposes, hierarchical arrangements based on perceived measures of prestige obtained from members of 29 specified groupings of teachers were determined for related sets of variables associated with each of the characteristics involved. Additional concerns focused on determining the relative importance of the seven professional and personal characteristics examined, and on describing the precise nature of attitudinal relationships between and among existing high and low prestige teacher groups regarding five dimensions of professionalism.

The results of the statistical analysis indicated that the positional characteristics hierarchy perceived by teachers in general is characterized by eight status categories representing four prestige levels, three of which are comprised of situses containing clusters of positions sharing equal prestige. The highest prestige level in this hierarchy consists of six principals' designations, five of which differ significantly from one another in the amounts of prestige they are accorded by teachers in general. Analysis of relevant data revealed that the five major positional teacher groups involved were in close agreement regarding the relative status of the 19 positional subgroups evaluated. However, it was established that the major group prestige

scores differ significantly between and among constituent subgroups on each positional category evaluated. Furthermore, the analyses produced evidence indicating that teachers as individuals tend to consistently rate more highly than other teachers the relative prestige of their own positions as well as the particular professional and personal characteristics which they possess.

According to the perceptions of teachers in general, and selected sub-groupings of this population, distinctive prestige hierarchies exist for the sets of professional and personal characteristics investigated. Prestige estimates obtained from the total teacher sample indicate that the most prestigious group is Senior High School teachers who possess between 11 and 20 years teaching experience, six or more years of university preparation and a record of service in an official ATA office. The personal qualities of this high prestige group indicate members to be males in the age range of 25 to 50 who have been prepared in Alberta universities. The low prestige group includes Division Two female teachers over 60 years of age who have been prepared outside of Canada, and who have less than three years of teaching experience, minimal qualifications and no service in an ATA office. Teachers, in general, regard teaching experience as the most important of the professional and personal characteristics evaluated and sex of teacher and ATA office held (identical prestige ranks) as the least important. When each professional and personal characteristic is considered separately, evidence indicates the presence of statistically significant differences among subgroups doing the evaluating with respect to measures of prestige attributed to each of the subgroups evaluated. Also, there is no tendency among the evaluating subgroups to assign identical ratings to categories associated with each professional and personal characteristic.

Attitudes of professionalism held by the high and low prestige positional groups do not differ significantly, but this is not the case for high and low prestige groups identified for each professional and personal characteristic. Despite the fact that the attitudes of these two categories of teachers do differ significantly on some of the dimensions of professionalism investigated, it is apparent from the findings that attitudinal differentials of this nature are not closely related to the prestige of the practitioner. The attitudes of teachers with congruent status differ significantly from those of teachers experiencing status incongruence regarding the concept of professional autonomy. Status congruent teachers' scores were higher for the autonomy dimension. Since this is the only instance where attitudes among these groups differ significantly, it does not appear that conditions which accompany either status condition constitute a highly sensitive factor affecting teachers' attitudes of professionalism.

The conclusions and implications resulting from the analyses may be of interest and value to persons who are concerned about the importance of the prestige component in the life and work of professional practitioners.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer expresses sincere thanks to the thesis supervisor, Dr. E. Miklos, for his most helpful guidance and willing assistance during the various stages of the study and to committee members, Dr. E.J. Ingram, Dr. R.G. McIntosh, Dr. R. Pannu and Dr. E. Ratsoy.

Appreciation is expressed to The Alberta Teachers' Association and in particular to the Provincial Executive Council for the cooperation received in facilitating the study. Sincere thanks is extended those members of The Alberta Teachers' Association who participated in the data gathering phases of the project.

The writer acknowledges with gratitude, the cooperation extended by Dr. R.H. Hall of the University of Minnesota in the construction of one of the instruments used.

The help of Elsie, a deserving wife, who provided much encouragement and assistance to the writer is acknowledged with deep appreciation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ABSTRACT iv

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS vii

LIST OF TABLES xii

LIST OF FIGURES xix

Chapter

I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM 1
  The Problem Defined, 1
  Background, 3
  Definition and Description of Terms, 10: Profession, 11; Professionalization, 11; Professionalism, 11; Positional Characteristics, 12; Professional Characteristics, 12; Personal Characteristics, 12; Prestige, 12; Status, 12; Hierarchy, 13; Teacher Subgroup, 13; Major Group, 13; Attitude, 13; Status Congruence, 14; Status Incongruence, 14
  The Sub-Problems, 14
  Significance of the Study, 16
  Assumptions, 20
  Limitations, 21
  Delimitation, 22
  Overview of the Report, 22

II. CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESES 24
  Nature of a Profession, 24: Definitions and Criteria, 25; The "Process" or "Emergent" Approach, 33
  Occupational Status and Prestige, 38: Measuring Occupational Status, 39; Measuring Occupational Prestige, 41; Empirical Studies of Occupational Prestige, 43; The Status of Teachers, 47; Intra-Occupational Prestige Studies, 50; Bases of Stratification, 54
  The Nature and Measurement of Attitudes, 56
  The Concepts of Status Congruence and Status Incongruence, 57
  Hypotheses, 59
  Summary, 62

III. INSTRUMENTATION 65
  Initial Development, 65: Personal-Educational Information Instrument, 66; Positional Characteristics Prestige Rating Scale, 67; Professional-Personal Characteristics Rating Scale, 67; Teacher Attitude Inventory, 68

Chapter Page

Development of the Pilot Study Inventory, 68
Pilot Study, 69: Pilot Sample, 69; Administration of the Teacher Questionnaire, 70
Revisions, 70: Analysis of Pilot Study Data, 70
Construction of the Prestige Differentials and Attitude Inventory (PDAI), 74: Personal-Educational Information Instrument, 76; Positional Prestige Rating Scale (PPRS), 76; Validity and Reliability of the Prestige Rating Instruments, 77; Teacher Attitude Inventory, 81; The Attitude/Behaviour Inventory, 81
Summary, 83

IV. SOURCES, COLLECTION, AND TREATMENT OF THE DATA 85
Sources and Collection of the Data, 85: The Sample, 85; The Prestige Differentials and Attitudes Questionnaire, 86
Treatment of Data, 88: Scoring, 88; Results of Scoring, 89; Results of Factor Analysis Treatment of Main Study Data, 89; Relationships Among Dimensions of Attitude Scales, 98
Treatment Procedures, 99
Summary, 103

V. THE NATURE OF POSITIONAL PRESTIGE HIERARCHIES IN TEACHING 104
Data Analysis Procedures, 104
Findings: Prestige Differentials Based on Total Sample Perceptions, 105
Findings: Prestige Differentials Based on Perceptions of Major Subgroups, 114
Discussion of Findings, 122
Summary, 125

VI. PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS AS DETERMINANTS OF PRESTIGE AMONG TEACHERS 129
Data Analysis Procedures, 130
Findings: Prestige Differentials Based on Total Sample Perceptions, 131: Professional Characteristics, 132; Personal Characteristics, 137; Personal Characteristics Prestige Hierarchies--Refined Versions, 139
Findings: Prestige Differentials Based on Selected Subgroup Perceptions, 141: Professional Characteristics, 141; Personal Characteristics, 151
Discussion of Findings, 158
Findings: Relative Importance of Professional-Personal Characteristics, 161
Discussion of Findings, 163
Summary, 164

Chapter Page

VII. ATTITUDINAL DIFFERENCES AMONG HIGH AND LOW PRESTIGE TEACHER GROUPS AND AMONG STATUS CONGRUENT AND INCONGRUENT TEACHER GROUPS 167
Data Analysis Procedures, 168
Findings: Attitudinal Differences Based on Positional Characteristics, 170
Findings: Attitudinal Differences Based on Professional Characteristics, 172: Teaching Experience, 172; Teaching Qualifications, 175; Teaching Level, 178; ATA Office Held, 178
Findings: Attitudinal Differences Based on Personal Characteristics, 184: Age, 184; Sex of Teacher, 187; Place of Professional Preparation, 187
Derivation of Groups Based on Combinations of Characteristics, 191
Findings: Attitudinal Differences Based on Combinations of Characteristics, 192
The Status Congruency-Incongruency Classification Model, 197
Findings: Attitudinal Differences Based on Status Congruency-Incongruency, 198
Discussion of Findings, 201
Summary, 206

VIII. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS 208
Summary of the Study, 208: The Problem, 208; The Conceptual Framework, 209; Hypotheses, 210; Instrumentation, 211; Pilot Study, 212; Data Collection, 213; Statistical Treatment, 213; Results of Statistical Analysis, 214; Attitudes of Professionalism, 216
Conclusions, 217
Implications, 221: General Implications, 221; Implications for Research, 226; Implications for Professional Associations (ATA), 226; Implications for Educational Administration, 228

BIBLIOGRAPHY 230

APPENDICES 239

A. Prestige Differentials Within the Alberta Teaching Force: An Inventory of Member Perceptions and Attitudes 240

B. Stratification of the Alberta Teaching Force: An Inventory of Member Perceptions and Attitudes 250
Pilot Study Questionnaire
Accompanying Letter of Request to Participants in the Pilot Study

C. Nature of Study Sample 274

Chapter Page

D. Tables Supplementary to Chapter VI: Results of ANOVA Treatment and Newman-Keuls Comparisons 276

LIST OF TABLES

Table | Page

1. Dimensions Included in Various Definitions of Professionalism 34
2. Judged Rank Order of Teaching Among Other Occupations . . . 49
3. Students' Perceptions of General Public's Ranking 52
4. Mean Scores of Students' Own Ranking 52
5. Principal-Axis With a Varimax Rotation Factor Solution for the Pilot Study Version of the Teacher Attitude Scale 73
6. Item Identification, Primary Factor Loading, Wording Style and Scoring Sequence for Items Included in the Teacher Attitude Inventory 75
7. Pearson "r" Correlation Coefficients for Items Included in the Positional Prestige Rating Scale (PPRS) 78
8. Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients Based on Mean Prestige Scores Indicating Relative Importance of Professional and Personal Characteristics 80
9. Comparison of Study Sample to Alberta Teacher Force by Percentages 87
10. Frequency of Response by Rating Scale Interval and Range of Mean Prestige Scores for Total Teacher Sample According to Positional Characteristic Evaluated 90
11. Frequency of Response by Rating Scale Interval and Range of Mean Prestige Scores for Total Teacher Sample According to Professional Characteristic Evaluated . . . 91
12. Frequency of Response by Rating Scale Interval and Range of Mean Prestige Scores for Total Teacher Sample According to Personal Characteristic Evaluated 92
13. Frequency of Response by Rating Scale Interval and Range of Mean Prestige Scores According to Relative Importance of Professional and Personal Characteristics as Perceived by Total Teacher Sample 93
14. Principal-Axis With a Varimax Rotation Factor Solution for the Teacher Attitude and Attitude/Behaviour Inventories (Five-Factor Field) 94

Table Page

15. Results Obtained from Factor Analysis of Study Data Produced by the Attitude/Behaviour Scale According to Varimax Rotations from Principal Axes Solutions for Four Factors 95

16. Orthogonal Varimax Rotations from Principal Axes Solutions for Four Factors: Hall vs. Snizek vs. Study Sample Data 97

17. Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients for Means of Summed Scores Based on Data Provided by Teacher Attitude and Behaviour/Attitude Measurement Scales 99

18. Mean Attitude Score and Standard Deviation Obtained for Total Teacher Sample According to Dimension of Professionalism Evaluated 100

19. Mean Prestige Scores, Standard Deviations and Prestige Ranks Based on Total Sample Response to Positional Prestige Rating Scale Items 106

20. Results of Analysis Using t-Test Method for Comparisons of PPRS Mean Item Scores Derived from Total Teacher Sample 109

21 Results of One-way ANOVA with Repeated Measures on One Factor for PPRS Total Sample Mean Item Scores 110

22. Comparison Among PPRS Total Sample Means Using Newman-Keuls Procedure Following One-way ANOVA with Repeated Measures on One Factor 111

23. Positional Prestige Hierarchy Resulting from Perceived Differences in Prestige by Total Teacher Sample 113

24. Report of Mean Positional Prestige Rating Scale Scores and Corresponding Prestige Rank by Teacher Subgroup for Each of the Five Major Positional Teacher Groupings . 116

25. Spearman Rhos Reported for Comparisons of Mean Prestige Subgroup Scores Ranked According to Major Positional Groups 118

26. Summary of Results Obtained Using Two-way ANOVA with Repeated Measures on Factor 'B' for Treatment of Positional Subgroup Mean Scores Derived from Five Major Positional Groups 118

Table Page

27. Prestige Rank Assigned to Positional Subgroups by the Five Positional Groups 120

28. Mean Prestige Score (MPS), Standard Deviation (SD) and Prestige Rank (PR) Obtained for Total Sample According to Professional Characteristic Evaluated 133

29. Prestige Hierarchies Obtained for Professional Characteristics after Analysis of Data Using One-way ANOVA Followed by N-K Procedure 136

30. Mean Prestige Score (MPS), Standard Deviation (SD) and Prestige Rank (PR) Obtained for Total Sample According to Personal Characteristic Evaluated 138

31. Prestige Hierarchies Obtained for Personal Characteristics after Analysis of Data Using One-way ANOVA Followed by Newman-Keuls Procedure 140

32. Mean Prestige Score (MPS), Standard Deviation (SD) and Prestige Rank (PR) Obtained for Selected Subgroups According to Professional Characteristic Evaluated . . . 142

33. Prestige Rank Assigned to Each Experience Category by Each Selected Teacher Subgroup 145

34. Prestige Rank Assigned to Each Teaching Level Category by Each Selected Teacher Subgroup 147

35. Prestige Rank Assigned to Each Teaching Qualifications Category by Each Selected Teacher Subgroup 148

36. Prestige Rank Assigned to Each ATA Office Held Category by Each Selected Teacher Subgroup 150

37. Mean Prestige Score (MPS), Standard Deviation (SD) and Prestige Rank (PR) Obtained for Selected Subgroups According to Personal Characteristic Evaluated 153

38. Prestige Rank Assigned to Each Age Category Evaluated by Each Selected Teacher Subgroup 154

39. Prestige Rank Assigned to Each Sex Category Evaluated by Male and Female Subgroups 155

40. Prestige Rank Assigned to Each Place of Professional Preparation Category Evaluated by Each Selected Teacher Subgroup 157

Table Page

41. Results of Analysis of Data Using One-way ANOVA Followed by Newman-Keuls (N-K) Procedure to Determine Relative Importance of Professional and Personal Characteristics According to Perceptions of Total Sample 162

42. Mean Attitude Score (MAS), Standard Deviation (SD), Results of One-way ANOVA and Newman-Keuls Comparison of Ordered Means by Dimension of Professionalism for High and Low Prestige Groups Classified on the Basis of Selected Positional Characteristics 170

43. Mean Attitude Score (MAS), Standard Deviation (SD), Results of One-way ANOVA and Newman-Keuls Comparison of Ordered Means by Dimension of Professionalism for High and Low Prestige Groups Classified on the Basis of Teaching Experience 173

44. Mean Attitude Score (MAS), Standard Deviation (SD), Results of One-way ANOVA and Newman-Keuls Comparison of Ordered Means by Dimension of Professionalism for High and Low Prestige Groups Classified on the Basis of Teaching Qualifications 176

45. Mean Attitude Score (MAS), Standard Deviation (SD), Results of One-way ANOVA and Newman-Keuls Comparison of Ordered Means by Dimension of Professionalism for High and Low Prestige Groups Classified on the Basis of Teaching Level 179

46. Mean Attitude Score (MAS), Standard Deviation (SD), Results of One-way ANOVA and Newman-Keuls Comparison of Ordered Means by Dimension of Professionalism for High and Low Prestige Groups Classified According to ATA Office Held 182

47. Mean Attitude Score (MAS), Standard Deviation (SD), Results of One-way ANOVA and Newman-Keuls Comparison of Ordered Means by Dimension of Professionalism for High and Low Prestige Groups Classified According to Age 185

48. Mean Attitude Score (MAS), Standard Deviation (SD), Results of One-way ANOVA and Newman-Keuls Comparison of Ordered Means by Dimension of Professionalism for High and Low Prestige Groups Classified According to Sex of Teacher 188

49. Mean Attitude Score (MAS), Standard Deviation (SD) and Results of One-way ANOVA for High and Low Prestige Groups Classified According to Place of Professional Preparation of Teacher 190

Table Page

50. Mean Attitude Score (MAS), Standard Deviation (SD), Results of One-way ANOVA and Newman-Keuls Comparison of Ordered Means by Dimension of Professionalism for High and Low Prestige Groups Classified According to the Professional Characteristics of Teaching Experience, Qualifications and Teaching Level 193

51. Mean Attitude Score (MAS), Standard Deviation (SD), Results of One-way ANOVA and Newman-Keuls Comparison of Ordered Means by Dimension of Professionalism for High and Low Prestige Groups Classified According to the Positional and Professional Characteristics of Teaching Position, Experience and Qualifications 195

52. Mean Attitude Score (MAS), Standard Deviation (SD), Results of One-way ANOVA and Newman-Keuls Comparison of Ordered Means by Dimension of Professionalism for Status Congruent and Status Incongruent Groups Classified on the Basis of Positional and Professional Factors 199

53. Comparisons According to Relative Size of Mean Attitude Scores of High and Low Prestige Groups by Dimension of Professionalism for Selected Positional, Professional and Personal Characteristics 205

54. Distribution of the Study Sample According to Position Held in School, Experience, Qualification, Teaching Level, ATA Office Held, Age, Sex and Place of Professional Preparation by Frequencies and Percentages . . 275

55. Results Obtained from One-way ANOVA Treatment of Total Sample Mean Prestige Scores for Each Teaching Experience Characteristic Evaluated 277

56. Results Obtained from One-way ANOVA Treatment of Total Sample Mean Prestige Scores for Each Teaching Level Characteristic Evaluated 278

57. Results Obtained from One-way ANOVA Treatment of Total Sample Mean Prestige Scores for Each Teaching Qualification Characteristic Evaluated 279

58. Results Obtained from One-way ANOVA Treatment of Total Sample Mean Prestige Scores for Each ATA Official Office Held Characteristic Evaluated 280

59. Significance of Differences Between Total Sample Mean Prestige Scores (MPS) on Each Category of Each Professional Characteristic 281

Table Page

60. Results Obtained from One-way ANOVA Treatment of Total Sample Mean Prestige Scores for Each Age Characteristic Evaluated 282

61. Results Obtained from One-way ANOVA Treatment of Total Sample Mean Prestige Scores for Each Sex Characteristic Evaluated 283

62. Results Obtained from One-way ANOVA Treatment of Total Sample Mean Prestige Scores for Each Place of Professional Preparation Characteristic Evaluated 284

63. Significance of Differences Between Total Sample Mean Prestige Scores (MPS) on Each Category of Each Personal Characteristic 285

64. Summary of Results Obtained Using Two-way ANOVA Method with Repeated Measures on Factor 'B' for Treatment of Subgroup Mean Prestige Scores on Teaching Experience Categories Evaluated 286

65. Summary of Results Obtained Using Two-way ANOVA Method with Repeated Measures on Factor 'B' for Treatment of Subgroup Mean Prestige Scores on Official ATA Office Held Categories Evaluated 287

66. Summary of Results Obtained Using Two-way ANOVA Method with Repeated Measures on Factor 'B' for Treatment of Subgroup Mean Prestige Scores on Teaching Level Categories Evaluated 288

67. Summary of Results Obtained Using Two-way ANOVA Method with Repeated Measures on Factor 'B' for Treatment of Subgroup Mean Prestige Scores on Teaching Qualification Categories Evaluated 289

68. Summary of Results Obtained Using Two-way ANOVA Method with Repeated Measures on Factor 'B' for Treatment of Subgroup Mean Prestige Scores on Age Categories Evaluated 290

69. Summary of Results Obtained Using Two-way ANOVA Method with Repeated Measures on Factor 'B' for Treatment of Subgroup Mean Prestige Scores on Sex of Teacher Categories Evaluated 291

70. Summary of Results Obtained Using Two-way ANOVA Method with Repeated Measures on Factor 'B' for Treatment of Subgroup Mean Prestige Scores on Place of Professional Preparation Categories Evaluated 292

Table Page

71. Results Obtained from One-way ANOVA Treatment of Total Sample Mean Prestige Scores for Professional and Personal Characteristics 293

72. Significance of Differences Between Total Sample Mean Prestige Scores (MPS) on Each Professional and Personal Characteristic 294

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure Page

1. Status Congruency-Incongruency Classification Model 58

2. Factors in the Status Congruent-Incongruent Classification Model 198

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The idea that approaches and methodologies similar to those employed in inter-occupational studies could be applied to investigate intra-occupational differences does not seem inconsistent with observations and suggestions advanced by scholars in this field. These researchers recognize that the rapid rate of technological and social change has resulted in unprecedented transformations within the occupation-profession structure. Using this perspective as a basis it was assumed that prestige differences, relative hierarchical positions and the consequences of these can also be observed and studied within one occupation, in the case of this study, teaching.

THE PROBLEM DEFINED

Studies of social stratification and of the professions includes substantial evidence to indicate that previous attempts to measure and assign status rankings to teachers on an inter-occupational basis have at best met with limited success. Bernbaum, et al. (1970) and Davies (1962) among others have pointed out some of the problems associated with these efforts and identified inadequacies in several of the major studies on this subject. It is proposed in this study that at least some of the difficulties encountered by previous researchers may be neutralized by studying a single occupation such as teaching from an intra-occupational perspective which recognizes the significant aspects of professions and professional life characterizing a single occupational group.

The central problem investigated in this study was concerned with an inquiry into the nature of prestige and attitude differentials within the Alberta teaching force. An analysis of teacher perceptions and attitudes related to selected factors associated with internal differentials and professionalism was undertaken. The importance of the prestige-status component in the professionalization of Alberta teachers was of major concern.

More specifically, the study attempted to identify and describe the nature of prestige hierarchies within the Alberta teaching profession on the basis of selected positional, professional and personal characteristics; to determine the relative importance of the professional and personal characteristics; to determine relationships among the perceived high and low prestige teacher groupings with respect to attitudes held on five selected dimensions of professionalism; and to compare the attitudes of professionalism held by teacher groups experiencing status congruence with those groups experiencing status incongruence.

Essentially, the four purposes of the study were:

1. To describe the hierarchical stratification based on selected positional, professional and personal characteristics within the teaching profession according to the perceptions of teachers in general, and specified teacher subgroups.
2. To determine the relative importance of the seven professional and personal characteristics selected for consideration.
3. To identify the high and low prestige groups within the study sample according to selected classifications of positional, professional and personal characteristics as well as in terms of combinations of these characteristics, and to compare the

attitudes of these high and low prestige groups on each of five dimensions of professionalism.

4. To determine the nature of attitudinal relationships regarding five specific attitudes of professionalism among teacher groupings classified as status congruent and status incongruent according to criteria established for this purpose.

The major problem involved determining mean prestige measures for the various teacher groupings, and subjecting appropriate sets of these measures to suitable statistical treatments to ascertain the significance of differences among and between them prior to assigning each a relative status rank. Mean attitude measures obtained for each of the high and low prestige groups were treated in the same fashion to determine which of the groups involved held the more positive attitude on each concept of professionalism examined.

BACKGROUND

The majority of inter-occupational studies concerned with matters relating to occupational status have consistently demonstrated that some occupations have higher prestige than do others. The degree to which this phenomenon is characteristic of positions within a particular occupation and the factors which contribute to intra-occupational prestige differentials are matters which have not as yet been thoroughly investigated. The relationship of prestige to attitudes of professionalism is a related area of concern which has not been given sufficient attention by researchers.

Prestige differences which are commonly observed among occupations often arise as a result of the money and power they appear to command in relation to one another. Why some receive greater material and non-material awards is not altogether clear even though several attempts have been made to explain this phenomenon. Davis and Moore (1962) argue that some occupations are functionally more important to society than others; that they require longer periods of training and greater sacrifice necessitating a system of awards capable of recruiting people into them. Tumin (1953) and others reject this view. They maintain that the differential distribution of occupational awards tends to support a given system of awards long after its functional requirements are met. There does not appear to be any general consensus on which of these is the better answer nor, according to Nosow and Form (1962), is there any other explanation for the rise and persistence of occupational stratification.

Occupational prestige or status differentials figure prominently in modern theories and discussions of social stratification in industrial societies. They seem to emphasize that occupational prestige has become a major basis of social stratification in modern industrialized societies. The close relationship between occupational and social status is illustrated by Bernbaum (1970:42) and his associates who argue that the concept of status,

> ... rests upon some notion of prestige which might be regarded as a feature of interpersonal recognition, involving one individual who 'claims' deference and another who is prepared to honour such a claim.

Taylor (1968:164) points out that "there is a differential prestige associated with the occupations in a particular stratum as well as between strata." Bases for this differentiation include such factors as the conditions, location and type of work as well as professional and personal characteristics of practitioners. In studies of inter-occupational prestige differentials, factors such as income and education have been commonly used. However, no final answer concerning the basis for hierarchical ranking of occupations has emerged. Nevertheless, sociologists still maintain that occupations remain as one of the very important categories of statuses used in organizing society.

The foregoing discussion suggests that widespread concerns among people may exist about the nature of stratification and its possible consequences within a single profession. An examination of the research and literature of the past decade which deals with occupational stratification suggests that approaches and methods of analysis differing from those used in the past are required to design meaningful investigations of prestige differentials focusing on a profession such as teaching.

Descriptive rather than analytic schemes of analysis are primarily responsible for the prevailing tendency of sociologists and persons located outside a particular occupation to regard it as a relatively homogeneous community whose members share common identity, roles, values, attitudes and interests. Until recently the sociology of the professions has given major attention to the sources of cohesiveness and to detailing the social structure of particular professions. Consequently, the concerned observer has tended to overlook the importance of the more subtle features of organization within a particular occupation as well as the impact for change in the occupation which may result from practitioners' differential interests and attitudes.

Bucher and Strauss (1961:325) point out,

> ... in actuality, the assumption of relative homogeneity within the profession is not entirely useful: There are many identities, many values, and many interests. These amount not merely to differentiation or simple variation. They tend to become patterned and shared; coalitions develop and flourish - and in opposition to some others.

These authors propose that professions are "... loose amalgamations of segments pursuing different objectives in different manners and more or less delicately held together under a common name at a particular period in history." The present study investigated some important positional, professional and personal characteristics of members of the Alberta teaching force in an attempt to provide a clearer understanding of how closely the occupation of teaching conforms to "profession" as described and defined by Bucher and Strauss.

The "process" or "emergent" approach to the study of the professions developed by Bucher and Strauss (1961:325) proposes a scheme of analysis based on what they refer to as "a common-sense point of view." This orientation requires one to recognize that in addition to the minimal structure which exists in any profession there is also great divergency of enterprise and endeavour. Also, there are cleavages that exist along with the division of labour and the intellectual and specialist movements that occur within "profession" boundaries. The "process" approach emphasizes that knowledge of the nature of the variations, segmentation and groupings within a profession is essential and useful if a comprehensive and realistic analysis of it is desired. The examination of such internal features as the importance of position held in school, professional and personal characteristics and attitudes of professionalism were central to the present study.

Subgroups based on such characteristics as subject specialty, qualifications, experience and teaching level emerge in a profession such as teaching. These are referred to by Bucher and Strauss (1961) as "segments" or identities which may eventually become highly organized. As such they may share an identity which is manifested through circles of colleagueship where one position or stand determines and leads to other corresponding ones. This phenomenon encourages particular groups to organize their professional activities in a way which distinguishes them from other members of their profession. Subject specialty groups and administrators' councils may be cited as examples of the presence of this phenomenon within the teaching profession.

Charters (1963:756-760) cites several empirical studies of the teacher stereotype which have been devoted exclusively to describing the characteristics which the public at large attributes to teachers. He notes that none of these particular studies give serious attention to how widely shared the attributions are and proceeds to criticize the methodology employed to obtain information about teachers. An investigation completed by Saltz (1960) attempted to define the components of the teacher "stereotype" held by the public. In this particular study Saltz (1960:109) concludes,

> The picture that emerges is one of an ambitious, domineering, managering, fussy, tyrannical woman who has powers that enable her to see more of people's motives than they wish to reveal. She has few friends; she is not interested in people's problems; social mingling is not to her liking. When things go wrong she rarely blames herself. Set in her ways, bound up in routine, she hesitates to do the unconventional.

It is conceivable that the observations and statements offered here, and many others similar in nature, may describe some individuals and situations quite accurately; however, to generalize about these matters as applicable to the total spectrum of the teaching occupation does not achieve any useful objective. More reliable information about teacher attitudes and relationships is needed to formulate a valid description of the modern teacher. One useful source of information is practicing teachers. An indication of how they perceive the relative importance of a vastly increased number of teaching functions and how they feel about their work would undoubtedly serve to condition "outsiders'" views regarding the nature of this occupational category.

Regardless of their relative position on an occupation-profession continuum such as the one proposed by Pavalko (1971:15-27) some measures of homogeneity or unity can usually be discovered to exist within the confines of any particular work group. In teaching, the socialization processes, norms and codes which tend to govern the behaviour of teachers may be such an obvious phenomenon that it causes the interested investigator to overlook significant aspects of this profession and its members. By focusing on an examination of prestige and attitude differences among various teacher groupings this study attempted to deal with some of the less obvious, but nevertheless important, aspects of teaching.

Reference to existing hierarchies in educational administration and counselling as well as to divisions along subject lines and grade levels taught provide examples of segmentation which illustrate the presence of this phenomenon in education. No doubt the increasing specialization which education is presently experiencing will tend to increase segmentation within the education profession. This trend is certain to have important implications for the professionalization of teaching. Further segmentation of this profession could hamper collective efforts to achieve increased relative status if appropriate measures are not taken to coordinate the multiplicity of differing interests. To implement such measures the leadership element requires knowledge of the nature of the various groupings; dominant interests, values and aspirations of all groups must be considered in policy development and execution. The nature of teacher perceived prestige hierarchies based on positional, professional and personal characteristics offers a useful referent for future planning at the organizational level.

Hall (1969:260) suggests that as differentiation or occupational specialization occurs, "the scope of each individual's activities is lessened and at the same time becomes more hidden from the people in other occupations." According to Caplow (1954), the requirements of each occupation, its responsibilities, and the evaluation of performance become more and more esoteric and removed from the area of the layman. Occupational title rather than qualities of the individual in the occupation become the basis for response. Caplow (1954:31) also maintains that differentiation has led to more highly developed authority systems within professional organizations since additional specialties require their own hierarchies and each hierarchy requires coordination with the whole. Those occupations located at the upper levels of the hierarchy are given greater status, and again the response is to an individual's title rather than to personal characteristics or performance.

Interest in measuring the social status of occupations has been lengthy and continuous as pointed out by Reiss (1961:1) who also explains the importance of differences in the prestige attached to occupations. According to him,

> ... the principal fact in accounting for the use of the term in empirical research has been the nature of the procedure for obtaining data to rank-order occupations. Whenever subjects are asked to evaluate or judge the rank, position or standing of occupations, most investigators refer to the 'prestige status' of the occupation in a larger social system so that the occupations may be rank-ordered by differences in their prestige status.

Kriesberg (1962:238) refers to several recent, pertinent studies as evidence of the source for the explanations which are neither complete nor unequivocal, establishing the bases for the occupational prestige hierarchy. These derive

> ... from evidence concerning the average prestige score of a wide range of occupations in different societies and the relationship between average prestige scores for certain occupations and the average scores for many different dimensions for the same occupations.

Empirical investigations such as the first major attempt to measure occupational prestige by Counts (1925) reveal several, and sometimes conflicting, concepts of prestige differences and the relative hierarchical positions which have been ascribed to occupations on the basis of perceived variations in the prestige component. The same literature is also informative on consequences and implications of rankings across occupational groups. These consequences and implications often result from such oversights as failing to take technological and social changes into account. No doubt this knowledge has contributed significantly to our increased understanding of the importance of occupational position in society. Nevertheless, a need still exists to extend research efforts into areas which are exclusively concerned with questions and inquiries pertaining to specific internal aspects of a single occupation such as teaching.

DEFINITION AND DESCRIPTION OF TERMS

The terms listed are basic to the discussion and hypotheses presented in this study. A subsequent section of this report includes a comprehensive analysis of the variations in usage characterizing the concepts of profession, professionalism and professionalization. Since consensus regarding their precise meanings is far from universal, definitions are provided which indicate the meaning attached to each for purposes of this study.

Profession

The definition of a profession which has been adopted for the purpose of this study includes the four common, specific attributes identified by Gezi and Meyers (1968:338). They are: (1) an intellectual competency based on specialized knowledge that requires a prolonged period of preparation, (2) a strong organization which has a clearly defined and enforceable code of ethics, (3) a high degree of autonomy for the group as well as for each of its members and (4) an emphasis upon service above economic gain. The definition of this term is expanded by including in it the Bucher and Strauss (1961:325) position which proposes that a profession consists of a "loose amalgamation of segments pursuing different objectives in different manners and more or less delicately held together under a common name at a particular period in history."

Professionalization

This term refers to the view enunciated by Corwin (1965:222) which indicates that professionalization is essentially, "a drive for status", representing the efforts of a vocation or a segment(s) of it to gain increased control over its work and to improve its social and economic position in society.

Professionalism

Vollmer and Mills (1966:vii) have defined professionalism as the ideology that may induce members of occupational groups to strive to become a profession. For the purpose of this study the term professionalism means the extent to which the ideology of the teacher respondents involved in the investigation is representative of the attitudes and beliefs identified in the five dimensions of professionalism selected for consideration.

Positional Characteristics

These characteristics either describe particular positions held in schools by teachers or they indicate the main educational functions performed by these personnel. Three examples of positions included in the Positional Prestige Rating Scale used are: Teachers - Physical Education, Principals - Elementary School, and Supervisors and Coordinators.

Professional Characteristics

These characteristics refer specifically to teaching experience, qualifications, teaching level and official offices held in the ATA.

Personal Characteristics

These characteristics refer specifically to the age, sex and place of professional preparation of a teacher.

Prestige

This term refers to what teachers believe about the worth and value of a positional, professional or personal characteristics regardless of whether the belief is as Taylor (1968:165) says, "valid in fact or not."

Status

The writer has adopted that definition of "status" proposed by Sherif and Sherif (1956:162) and extended by Ratsoy (1966:6):

> Repeated interaction over time of individuals who have common goals and motives gives rise to a group structure consisting of roles and hierarchical statuses. A status is a "differentiated

position" in the hierarchy of positions in the group, having meaning in relation to other positions in the hierarchy.

Hierarchy

In this study the term refers to an ordering of statuses of teacher groups or of characteristics according to their relative importance as perceived by other specified teacher groupings.

Teacher Subgroup

This term is used throughout this study to describe various clusters of sample respondents possessing specified positional, professional or personal characteristics, or selected combinations of these characteristics. Examples are: Teachers - Fine Arts subjects, Teachers over 60 years of age and Teachers prepared outside of Canada.

Major Group

Major group refers to a particular grouping of teachers derived from combining two or more teacher subgroups classified according to one specific positional characteristic.

Attitude

Newcomb (1943:18) has defined attitude as, "simply a viewing with some degree (including zero degree) of favour or disfavour. Almost anything, obviously may be so viewed." Bonner (1953:189) states that, "An attitude is a state of somebody towards something. This 'something' toward which an attitude is directed is a value." Thurstone's (1959:216) definition of this concept explains attitude as, "... the sum total of a man's inclinations and feelings, prejudice or bias, preconceived notions, ideas, fears, threats, and convictions about any specific topic ...." Since these definitions are essentially in agreement for the purpose of this study the concept attitude will mean the verbal expression of one's attitudes as defined above, delimited to those specific attitudes of professionalism measured by the Teacher Attitude Scale developed for this study and the Revised Hall Scale which was also used for obtaining indices of professionalism.

Status Congruence

This term will refer to the condition experienced by teachers who possess one of the combinations of positional and professional status factors specified below:

1. Performs administrative duties, has at least a B.Ed. degree and between six and 20 years of teaching experience or,
2. Teaches but does not perform any administrative duties, has less professional preparation than a B. Ed. degree and less than six or more than 20 years teaching experience.

Status Incongruence

Refers to the condition experienced by teachers who possess one of the combinations of positional and professional status factors specified below:

1. Performs administrative duties, has less professional preparation than a B.Ed. degree and less than six or more than 20 years of teaching experience or,
2. Teaches but does not perform any administrative duties, has at least a B.Ed. degree and between six and 20 years teaching experience.

THE SUB-PROBLEMS

A statement of the major problem, the related discussion presented for it and the definitions of terms basic to this study provided the basis for selecting several researchable sub-problems. They include the following:

1. a. What is the prestige hierarchy based on positional characteristics as perceived by the total teacher sample?
   b. What is the prestige hierarchy as perceived by each of the selected positional teacher subgroups?
2. a. What is the prestige hierarchy based on the professional characteristics of teaching experience, teaching level, teaching qualifications and ATA office held as perceived by the total teacher sample?
   b. What is the prestige hierarchy for each of the four professional characteristics specified in 2(a) above according to the perceptions of each selected teacher subgroup?
3. a. What is the prestige hierarchy based on the personal characteristics of age, sex and place of professional preparation as perceived by the total teacher sample?
   b. What is the prestige hierarchy for each of the three personal characteristics specified in 3(a) above according to the perceptions of each selected teacher subgroup?
4. What is the relative importance of the selected professional and personal characteristics in determining teacher prestige?
5. Are attitudes of professionalism related to the prestige of selected groups?
   a. Do members of high prestige positional groups differ in attitudes held from those belonging to low prestige positional groups?

b. Do members of high prestige teaching level, teaching experience, teaching qualifications and ATA official groups differ in attitudes of professionalism held from those belonging to the corresponding low prestige teacher groups?

c. Do members of high prestige age, sex and place of professional preparation groups differ in attitudes of professionalism held from those belonging to the corresponding low prestige teacher groups?

d. Do the attitudes of professionalism for high prestige teacher groups based on some combination of positional, professional and personal characteristics differ from those of the low prestige teacher groups?

6. Are the attitudes of teacher groups which have positional-professional status congruence different from the attitudes of teacher groups that experience status incongruence?

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Professional stratification may be a divisive force which operates within a profession to reduce its power and influence relative to that possessed by other interacting groups. Knowledge of the nature and extent of this fragmentation would reveal the amount of interference generated against professionalization (the drive toward higher status). Indicators which point to the increasing trend for new prestige levels to emerge within teaching are evidenced by developments such as modifications or supplements to the single salary structure, the creation of an unprecedented number of subject specialty groups among teachers and the expressed desire among those new entities for increased autonomy and recognition. These changes probably have resulted in an increase in the number of levels in the hierarchy of teaching and the number of teachers in receipt of allowances above the basic salary scale. Changes in the system of rewards could change the structure of a profession. This may have a profound effect upon the self-image of the individual if his relative status is affected. Thus the feelings accompanying status incongruence could be a significant factor interfering with any unified professionalization effort.

These observations suggest that if teachers and Association officials were better informed about the nature of attitudinal differences which exist as a result of prestige differentiation, appropriate action could be taken to unify the profession's effort to secure higher status for the individual.

If the bases on which stratification rests were understood more clearly it would facilitate efforts to assess the importance of factors like role differentiation, increasing specialization and segmentation as stimulators of the stratification process. We could be more certain about contributory factors and their relative impact on creating prestige structures within teaching by directing some research toward this end.

The diversity of interests, values and attitudes which usually characterize prestige differentials can have important consequences for the way in which the individual relates to his work, his colleagues and his professional organization. If some of these relationships can be revealed and accurately associated with the major groupings which exist within teaching a more satisfactory basis for dealing with internal conflict and dissension may become apparent.

There is very little evidence to suggest that previous approaches concerned with the status of teaching have proceeded from the perspective that different categories of teachers operate in different work situations. Bernbaum et al. (1970:41) point out,

> ... it is commonplace in much of the relevant literature that the question of status is significant to the critical issue of the recruitment of teachers, but this is rarely considered in terms of the prestige differences within the occupation.

These authors emphasize the linkage between questions of status and important practical issues like teachers' financial rewards, career prospects and job satisfaction. The possibility that the status of the occupation ~~and the~~ differentials within it could be linked to classroom performance and teachers' relationships with other professionals is also recognized.

During the past decade a number of significant developments have occurred in the field of Alberta education which will undoubtedly influence the relative status of the teaching occupation. Some of these developments are:

1. Several important changes have occurred in the general objectives of education and in the structure and functions of educational organizations. Education for leisure and for lifelong living, early childhood education and the individualization of instruction are examples of new emphases in Alberta education. Opportunity rooms and specially designed vocational-technical schools equipped to offer programs for the non-academic student are not uncommon phenomena today. Several urban and rural schools now serve as community centres for daytime and evening activities organized in conjunction with regular school services.
2. A new form of teacher militancy has stimulated an extensive

increase in the activities of The Alberta Teachers' Association. Educational finance, teacher education, labour legislation and professional autonomy are examples of areas where increased involvement has occurred.

3. Substantive changes regulating all phases of education including finance have been incorporated into government statutes.
4. The unfavourable attitudes of various publics toward professionals have intensified on a national front. This is evidenced by a variety of government committees and commissions which have been established to investigate a number of professions including teaching. The report of the Alberta Legislative Committee on the Professions was on the order paper for the 1973 Spring Session of the Legislature; the Quebec and Ontario reports were completed in 1970 and the Manitoba White Paper on this subject was to appear in 1973. Reference to special articles contained in the Edmonton Journal (May 3, August 23, 1972) are illustrative of the nature and extent of public protest against professions which serve the Alberta sector.
5. The proliferation of semi or pseudo-professions in teaching is apparent. These entities include people such as audio and video specialists, performance contractors and technical, vocational and commercial tradesmen who are engaged to offer a variety of special education programs to adults and students.
6. Increased bureaucratization of education has occurred in the sense that the control units have vastly increased the number of administrative and supervisory personnel in their systems' structures. e.g. Finance Analysts, Directors of Curriculum,

Special Education, Religious Education and Instructional Personnel are relatively new and common positions.

7. Another recent development which supports the need for additional research focusing on internal aspects of the teaching profession is the Report of the Commission on Educational Planning released in 1972. Several recommendations contained in this most recent addition to the literature on future educational reform in Alberta single out teaching, teachers and their profession for critical appraisal. Of particular relevance to the present study are the recommendations pertaining to planned differentiation (1972:70-71), professionalization and teacher's role (1972: 193-197).

While it was not possible in the scope of this study to explore all of the issues which could possibly arise as a result of the hierarchical stratification characterizing the teaching profession, it did examine a selected number of variables generally regarded as important determinants of prestige among teachers. In addition, an indication of the relative importance of these determinants according to practitioners was obtained. Attitudes of various high and low prestige groupings within the Alberta teaching force were examined on five different aspects of professionalism.

ASSUMPTIONS

The basic assumption is that prestige can be estimated and that it lies in opinions of people rather than in a profession itself, or in any specific rewards attached to a position or characteristic. Consequently, it was also assumed that the method to employ in this study was to secure judgments from teachers themselves about the prestige position of the teacher groupings and characteristics selected for investigation.

LIMITATIONS

1. A major limitation of this study is the method used to determine relative statuses of the teacher characteristics examined and indices of professionalism held by various high and low prestige groups. Since a mailed questionnaire was used as the information gathering technique it should be noted that the reliability of this method is subject to the usual limitations associated with it. The study is also limited in the extent to which it can be assumed that verbal responses to questionnaires provide an accurate account of teachers' cognitions about the concepts being investigated.
2. Inferences regarding the causes of relationships identified among the variables examined cannot be made, but speculation about these relationships is possible. Inferences drawn from the study regarding specified relationships will apply only to those organizations exhibiting the structural and functional characteristics of The Alberta Teachers' Association.
3. Possible consequences of the hierarchical stratification found to exist within the Alberta teaching force and of the attitudes held by the various strata toward professionalism are not dealt with in this study.

DELIMITATION

1. This study was concerned with that sector of occupations classified as professions and not with the entire spectrum of occupations. It was further delimited to a single profession in the Province of Alberta -- teaching.
2. Numerous factors other than those selected for establishing the prestige hierarchies in teaching may contribute to the perceptions teachers hold about prestige. For the purpose of this study the factors selected were those which appear to have figured most prominently in the relevant research.
3. The study took into consideration only that information which was collected by the instruments used for this purpose.

OVERVIEW OF THE REPORT

The problem has been defined and discussed in Chapter I. Background information pertinent to the study and its importance was provided. Terms with special meanings were defined or described and the assumptions, limitations and delimitation of the study were stated. Chapter II is devoted to a discussion of the theoretical bases developed for the study, a review of related literature and research and a statement of the hypotheses to be tested. Chapter III describes the procedures followed in the construction and validation of the instruments developed to collect the data. The initial, pilot study and final stages in the development of the instruments are explained. Chapter IV reports on the nature of the study sample and the structure of the prestige and attitude scales which were used. Details of the scoring and statistical treatment procedures employed in the analysis of the data are also presented. The next three chapters report on the findings obtained from analyses carried out to test the hypotheses. They consist of evidence based on statistically significant differences in mean prestige and attitude scores which reveal the nature of relationships between and among the various teacher groupings on the positional, professional, personal and attitude variables examined. The concluding chapter includes a summary of the findings, a list of conclusions and statement of relevant implications. The appendices contain samples of the instruments used and tables which are supplementary to various parts of the study.

DOMTAR
BELL-FAST BOND

CHAPTER II

CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESES

This chapter is devoted to a review of relevant literature and research dealing with those aspects of the study considered essential for the development of a suitable theoretical framework. The 12 hypotheses developed for investigating the various sub-problems are stated. More specifically, pertinent theoretical, methodological and research findings focusing on concepts of profession, professionalization and professionalism, on occupational status and prestige, on significant attitudinal factors and on the relationships of these to the problem being investigated describes the nature of the content presented in this chapter.

NATURE OF A PROFESSION

Talcott Parsons (1968:536) reminds us that,

> ...the development and increasing strategic importance of the professions probably constitute the most important change that has occurred in the occupational system of modern societies.

He observes the tendency of professions to dominate public discussion today and points out a feature characterizing the boundaries of the group system generally called the professions. They are "fluid and indistinct."

Authors such as Gilb (1966) and Whyte (1956) offer impressive documentation to show the drastic transformation in the world of work and the life-styles of workers. Their writings illustrate that wherever we look -- at the religious, economic, governmental or educational sector of society -- new and changed kinds of professions are an abundant reality. In his opening address to the 1971 Conference on The Professions in the Commonwealth, Rahim Ishak (1971:10) emphasized that the solution to many national problems resides in gaining "... an understanding of the specialized features of the professionals in our society." According to Slocum (1966:119) the concept of profession is a "folk concept" which has emotional content and a morally desirable connotation due to its common and widespread usage. Hughes (1958:44) refers to profession as a term indicative of "value and prestige", or as "a symbol for a desired conception of one's work, and hence, of one's self."

There is no short, adequate answer to questions concerned with identifying commonly regarded attributes of occupations and with attempting to distinguish profession from occupation. The extensive body of research and writing dealing with the characteristics of professions includes a wide variety of materials ranging from the historical development of particular occupations to case studies of the status of specific work activities as professions. These sources have contributed significantly to the definitional problem which exists by compounding semantic confusion with the use of prefixes like pseudo-, semi-, quasi-, emerging-, and others. Despite the proliferation of varying definitions and descriptions of profession, professionalism and professionalization substantial consensus has emerged to permit the identification of key features of work groups that appear to differentiate occupations from professions.

Definitions and Criteria

In his treatise on professions Talcott Parsons (1968:536) recognizes the many borderline groups whose professional status is ambiguous but contends that the "core criteria within the more general category of occupational role seems to be relatively clear." In his opinion the three basic criteria of a profession include:

1. The requirement of formal technical training accompanied by some institutionalized mode of validating its adequacy and the competence of trained individuals.
2. A mastery of the cultural tradition and the development of skills in some form of its use.
3. An institutionalized means of ensuring that competence will be put to socially responsible uses.

An examination of the literature suggests that the classic work of Carr-Saunders and Wilson (1933) in this field has provided a basis for the numerous descriptions and definitions of profession developed. In expressing their belief in the reality of criteria by which to judge occupations as being "professions", Carr-Saunders and Wilson (1933:284) write,

> ... to members of the professions and to the public alike the word is pregnant with meaning. The group formed by the professions is therefore no mere sociological abstraction; indeed the public has long been in advance of the sociologist in that it has recognized the essential interest and importance of professionalism (1933:1) ... the term profession clearly stands for something. That something is a complex of characteristics, (1933:284) which include ... intellectual competence, a prolonged period of specialized training, and the formation of a professional organization.

Flexner's (1915:576-590) discussions of the criteria of "professionalism" (the article entitled, "Is Social Work a Profession?") date back to 1915. He singled out motivation for service as the most important criterion. While many contemporary writers on the subject have repeated the type of analysis he initiated, others have attempted to avoid what have been referred to as contradictions and ambiguities in his approach by taking into account occupational differentiation and the demands for professional status brought about by unprecedented specialization.

According to Slocum (1966:121) popular belief expressed by many of the recent studies on the sociology of work suggests that the distinction between what is generally regarded as profession and certain other occupations "seems to be a matter of degree rather than a matter of kind." Consistent with this thinking a theoretical model comprised of eight core dimensions or characteristics of work was developed by Pavalko (1971:26) to differentiate occupations from professions. His notion of an occupation-profession continuum is based on an attempt to illustrate more accurately the extent to which a particular work activity is a profession. In this context profession refers to an extreme end of a continuum of work characteristics. To qualify as a profession the work activity would have to exhibit, to a high degree, the complex of work characteristics specified by Pavalko (1971:18-26).

Vollmer and Mills (1966) restrict their use of the term "profession" to refer to an ideal type of occupational organization which does not exist in reality but does provide the model of the form of organization that would result if any occupational groups became completely professionalized. If the concept of "profession" applies only to an abstract model of occupational organization, then the concept of "professionalization" Vollmer and Mills (1966:vii-viii) suggest is the process,

> ... whereby many occupations can be observed to change certain crucial characteristics in the direction of a 'profession', even though some of these may not move very far in this direction.

These authors subscribe to the idea of an occupation-profession continuum which locates profession at one end and non-profession at the opposite end. Professionalism is the ideology that may induce members of occupational groups to strive to become a profession through the process of a distinctive change experienced by occupations in transition (professionalization).

The NEA (1968:8) suggested eight criteria identifying "profession" which do not differ substantially from many of those mentioned later.

Myron Lieberman (1956:2-6) also advanced eight characteristics which he claimed must be present to some degree in all recognized professions. Except for the characteristic which specified an acceptance by the practitioners of broad personal responsibility for judgments made and acts performed within the scope of professional autonomy, these criteria are similar to those proposed by several of the authorities referred to in this section of the report.

Wilensky's (1964) frequently quoted article discusses the nature of professions and discounts the idea that all occupations are moving toward professional status. Probably the claims made by authors like Foote (1953) and Barber (1963) which suggest that, "the professionalization of labour" is a general trend, and that the "elite" in social work are "clearly professionals" prompted him to label this idea as "a bit of sociological romance." Wilensky (1964:142-146) concentrates on describing a sequence of eight steps in professionalization to describe profession. Four of these steps are worthy of note:

1. Redefinition of the core task, so as to give the "dirty work" over to the subordinates;
2. Conflict between the old timers and the new men who seek to upgrade the job;
3. Competition between the new occupation and neighboring ones;
4. Political agitation in order to gain legal protection.

Greenwood (1957:44-55) suggested the idea of occupations being distributed along a vertical continuum with the established professions at the top and the unskilled manual occupations at the bottom. The elements which he maintains a profession must possess include:

1. A basic systematic theory;
2. An authority recognized by the clientele of the professional group;
3. A broader community sanction and approval of this authority;
4. A code of ethics regulating relations of professional persons with clients and colleagues;
5. A professional culture sustained by formal professional associations.

Bernard Barber (1963:672), Pavalko (1971) and several others have acknowledged the non-existence of absolute differences between professional and other kinds of occupational behaviour. Barber (1963) proposes a scale comprised of four attributes to measure occupational behaviour and singles out the professional culture which develops due to formal and informal groupings, as the most crucial characteristic differentiating professions from other occupations.

Moore (1970:5-6) develops his definition of a "profession" after identifying four commonly noted characteristics (of unequal value) which make up his suggested scale of professionalism. These elements which establish the points or clusters along the scale include full-time occupational practice, commitment to a calling, specialization and professional autonomy. The definition of a "profession" which emerges from Moore's discussion (1970:53-54) states that it is,

> ... an occupation whose incumbents create and explicitly utilize systematically accumulated general knowledge in the solution of problems posed by a clientele (either individuals or collectivities).

A number of prominent writers on the subject including Caplow (1954), Goode (1968), Gross (1958) and Corwin (1965) have chosen to refer either directly or indirectly to professionalization to describe the significant traits of a profession. Typical of the writing of these authors, and particularly those like Bucher and Strauss, is a tendency to reject, or at least question, the structure of a profession portrayed in the classical model. Rather than accepting the unitary approach which seems to view professions as relatively homogeneous groups, they developed variations of the professional model which attempt to recognize existing differences across the professions. Bucher and Strauss concentrate on identifying the internal variations of professions.

The central idea suggested by Goode's model views the professions as dependent communities within the larger society. Goode (1957) observes that criteria usually cited for professionalism often parallel community attributes.

Theodore Caplow (1954:139-140) maintains that there is a predictable, explicit sequence of four definite steps which occupations follow to assume the attributes of a profession. These steps are:

1. The establishment of a professional association;
2. The change of name;
3. The development and promulgation of a code of ethics;
4. Prolonged political agitation, whose object it is to obtain the support of the public power for the maintenance of the occupational barriers and consequently to the development of training facilities directly or indirectly controlled by the professional society.

Caplow, in suggesting such a definitive and universal process of professionalization, fails to recognize that different occupations engaged in professionalization, particularly those of more recent origin, will not necessarily experience the same degree of change during each step in the sequence as those which established themselves earlier.

According to Corwin (1965:222) professions can be viewed in two ways:

1. In terms of a set of ideal structural characteristics which they are supposed to possess, and
2. As vocations in the process of achieving these characteristics.

In Corwin's (1965:222) view, from the ideal structural perspective a profession exhibits:

1. A legal monopoly over the application of the knowledge to the solution of social problems and,
2. Legal control over its membership, including control of the licensing standards and a code of ethics sanctioned by law.

As vocations proceeding toward professional status Corwin (1965:222) claims that there are three criteria indicative of the progress achieved by a profession:

1. Level of educational standards established for admission to the vocation,
2. Advances accomplished in raising prestige and economic standing and,
3. The autonomy achieved by the group over control of its own work activities.

In Corwin's (1965:222) view, professionalization is essentially, "a drive for status", representing the efforts of a vocation to gain full control over its work and to improve its social and economic position in society.

Becker (1962:32) struck a new note in the literature by pursuing what he termed a "radically sociological view" to identify professions as,

> ...those occupations which have been fortunate enough in the politics of today's work world to gain and maintain possession of that honourific title. On this view, there is no such thing as the 'true' profession and no set of characteristics necessarily associated with the title. There are only those groups which are commonly regarded as professions and those which are not.

For him, a "profession" is a folk concept, a symbol which he maintains most professions have failed to match in their actual practice.

Probably a statement made by Gezi and Meyers (1968:338) sufficiently summarizes the numerous attempts which have been made to delineate the characteristics of a profession. These authors maintain that an objective examination of all the criteria found in the literature can be synthesized into four common, specific attributes as follows:

1. An intellectual competency based on specialized knowledge that requires a prolonged period of preparation,
2. A strong organization which has a clearly defined and enforceable code of ethics,
3. A high degree of autonomy for the group as well as for each of its members,
4. An emphasis upon service above economic gain.

Reference to a current and comprehensive analyses of the literature dealing with the concept of "profession", and the process of professionalization, a review prepared by Stinson (1970:16-203), suggests that some progress is discernible regarding a general consensus about the criteria of "profession" and the nature of the process of "professionalization."

Hrynyk's study (1966) points to the consistency which exists among the several definitions of a profession. To illustrate the degree of consensus present among 23 writers on five basic dimensions descriptive of professions, a table (slightly modified) prepared by Hrynyk (1966:11) for this purpose is reproduced here as Table 1.

The "Process" or "Emergent" Approach

Reference has been made in Chapter I, to the analytical approach to the study of professions developed by Bucher and Strauss (1966). Some elaboration of their proposals is considered appropriate here in order to formulate the theoretical approach to be used in this study.

To illustrate application of "the common sense approach", Bucher and Strauss (1961:326) selected medicine as the prototype of "profession." However, they point out that some other profession would have served equally as well. Consequently, this analytical approach may be applied to teaching.

In order to structure their concept of professions Bucher and Strauss adopted a position which differs in many respects from the prevailing viewpoint characteristic of functionalism. Goode (1957:194-200), and others of his leaning see "profession" as a homogeneous community where members have similar interests, values, attitudes, roles and identities. In contrast, the "process" approach focuses on change and conflicting interests to ensure that the analyst will remain cognizant of the many differences which may be present within any one profession. The central thesis of this approach is rooted in the belief, Bucher and Strauss (1961:325) write, that professions are,

> ... loose amalgamations of segments pursuing different objectives in different manners and more or less delicately held together under a common name at a particular period in history.

Central to their model is the idea of internal heterogeneity and segmentation.

In describing each of the seven concepts which constitute the "process model", stress is placed on illustrating how activities related

Table 1

Dimensions Included in Various Definitions of Professionalism

Writer	Dimension of Professional Orientation				
	Knowledge & Skill	Service Ideal	Formal Organization	Colleagues - Profession	Autonomy - Client
*Barber	x	x			
Becker	x	x	x	x	
Caplow	x	x	x		x
Carr-Saunders	x		x	x	x
Clayton	x	x			x
Cogan	x	x			x
Corwin	x		x	x	x
Flexner	x	x	x		
*Gezi and Meyers	x	x	x		x
Goode	x	x		x	x
Goodman	x	x	x		x
Greenwood	x	x	x	x	x
Gross	x	x		x	x
Hall		x			x
Klass	x	x	x	x	x
Lewis and Maude	x		x		x
Lieberman	x	x	x		x
Lindsey	x	x			
McGlothin	x	x	x	x	
Marshall	x	x	x		
Millerson	x	x	x	x	x
*Moore	x	x			x
Nosow and Form	x	x	x	x	
Parsons			x	x	
*Pavalko	x	x		x	x
Tyler	x		x		
Wilensky	x	x	x	x	

Reproduced with minor modifications (*) from Hrynyk (1966).

to each concept generate internal diversity and divergence in a profession. Explanations associated with each concept which appear to have particular relevance for the teaching profession have been extracted from the original discussion for inclusion in the summary account which follows:

The Sense of Mission. Typically, specialties conceive and claim a unique mission. They alone claim to be able to make the unique contribution and show why they are peculiarly fitted to the task. Those that are labelled as unequal to the task are excluded. Although each profession claims its own unique mission, each segment within it claims a unique contribution toward that general mission. This sense of mission is such that it is portrayed as the "raison d'être" for the profession's existence.

Work Activities. There is a great diversity in the tasks performed in the name of any profession. Inconsistency between segments occurs regarding the precise nature of the work function, its organization and priority. Within any particular core specialty there are many different kinds of practice ranging from the general to the highly skilled functions. Assigning more importance to some activities than others such as in the case of research and the preparation of professionals adds to further diversification. This illustrates the divergence of opinion which may exist among any group of practitioners with respect to what actually constitutes the core. Hence, there is a tendency for segments that have developed divergent core activities to develop additional associated activities which diversifies even further, commitment to major areas such as research and teaching.

Methodology and Technique. Methodology and technique produce the most profound divisions within a profession. Bucher and Strauss (1961:328) observe that,

> Methodological differences can cut across specialty - and even professional - lines with specialists sharing techniques with members of other specialties which they do not share with their fellows.

Clients. The relationships between special groups of practitioners and their clients may vary greatly in a profession from the ideal established for the profession as a whole. Specialties or segments of specialties tend to concentrate on developing images of relationships with clients designed to enhance the uniqueness and importance of the specialized service they provide. Their own sense of mission and the distinctive nature of their job compel them to create separate identities by defining, elaborating and idealizing the practitioner-client relationship for their particular grouping.

Colleagueship. The conception of colleagueship presented by Gross (1958:223-235) stresses the occupational unity of participants. This approach does not recognize that such unifying features of a profession also may operate as divisive factors since as Bucher and Strauss (1961:330) point out,

> What ties a man more closely to one member of his profession may alienate him from another: when his group develops a unique mission, he may no longer share a mission with others in the same profession.

The nature of circles of colleagueship advanced by Bucher and Strauss suggests that colleagues hold common notions about the ends served by their work and attitudes and problems centering on it. Consequently, the existence of segments limits and directs colleagueship.

Interests and Associations. In considering the extent to which professionals have interests in common, Bucher and Strauss suggest that this is so to the extent that their "fate" is bound together. By too readily assuming unity of interest among professionals a rich area for research has been overlooked since, as Bucher and Strauss (1961:330) point out,

> ... interests do diverge within a profession is clear enough when the observer looks for it; not only may interests run along different lines, but they may be, and frequently are, in direct conflict.

Areas concerned with seeking some control of institutions, recruitment and external public relations are highly sensitive matters and the source of much of the conflict of interest among members for competing segments.

Spurious Unity and Public Relations. The element of spurious unity is interpreted primarily as the type of unity which is created solely to serve the interests of a profession and the special interests of its members. It is created by codes of ethics, licensing arrangements and similar professional activity but it does not necessarily constitute evidence of internal homogeneity and consensus. Rather, these features are evidence of the power held by various segments in the profession. The segments in power often control the organs of public relations and act as spokesman for the entire profession. To the outsider the profession appears to offer a solid front, a perspective not always held by the membership.

Bucher and Strauss present a description of the diversity and movement which take place among the various groups of people who organize their professional activities in ways which distinguish them from other members of their profession.

Although the "process" approach to the study of professions may not be the most fruitful method of analysis to employ in all cases, it does seem to offer a useful alternative which focuses on the differences and change experienced by professions in transition. The author of a recent publication who subscribes to the "process approach", Elliot Krause (1971:7), reveals that the strategy of his book "... even when we take a systems approach, is that of Bucher and Strauss, the study of profession in process."

A number of other authors refer to characteristics of professions which suggest the potential use of the "process" model. Zald (1971:26-30) discusses the fragmentation of professions and mentions the need to redefine fields of practice into sub-units. Hall (1969:90-137) stresses the importance of intraprofession variations for understanding the nature of the professions and investigates the sources of professional variation and differentiation in terms of attitudes of profession found in professional organizations. The extensive subdivision of existing professions and implications of the process of occupational differentiation are also pointed out by Caplow (1954:21-24). The views expressed by Lieberman (1956:259) on types of professional organizations include reference to the different, as well as common, interests held by professionals and the multiplicity of specialized associations found within a profession.

OCCUPATIONAL STATUS AND PRESTIGE

Preliminary to discussing some conclusions regarding the stability of occupational status and occupational prestige Pavalko (1971:132) notes that, "occupational status and occupational prestige are frequently used interchangeably and as surrogates for other concepts such as 'social class'." This practice is unfortunate in his view because the terms represent different aspects and dimensions of occupations. Conflicting or at least varying positions on this issue characterize this particular field of study. No doubt this is one of the reasons contributing to the multiplicity of problems and disagreements exhibited by the relevant literature.

Dubin (1961:283) maintains that status is always evident in a system of rankings where there are at least two individuals or groups to compare and that such a comparison has to indicate which one is "better", "higher", or "more important." Another position put forth by Bernbaum et al. (1970:42) suggests that "status rests upon some notion of prestige which might be regarded as a feature of interpersonal recognition, involving one individual who 'claims' deference and another who is prepared to honour such a claim."

Measuring Occupational Status

Among the numerous attempts to develop scales and schemes for measuring occupational status a few have gained popular recognition.

Interest in the study of occupational rank dates back to 1897 when William Hunt arranged gainful workers into four classes: proprietary, clerical, skilled worker and labouring. In 1917, Alba Edwards extended this scale into nine socio-economic categories and much later (1933) developed a scale, reported by Pavalko (1971:113), grouping occupations into six broad categories ranked from high to low as follows:

1. Professional persons
2. Proprietors, managers, officials
3. Clerks and kindred workers
4. Skilled workers and foremen
5. Semiskilled workers
6. Unskilled workers

Reismann (1959:145) indicates that this scale was intended as a classification which could,

> ... fit all occupations reported in the census into a relatively limited set of categories, that would combine occupations together insofar as they connoted a common life style and social characteristic.

Numerous variants of this scale have been developed such as the one produced by Centers (1949) which differentiated business occupations on the basis of size and placed professions below this category.

Reiss (1961:263-275) discusses one of the most widely used measures of occupational status; the scale developed by Duncan in 1961 using data from the 1950 American census. This "socioeconomic index" is based on the educational attainment and income of persons from 500 different occupations.

Blishen (1968:741-753) developed a similar scale based on Canadian census data and refers to the revised version which used 1961 census data.

The occupational status scale produced by Nam and Powers (1968: 167-170) used 1960 census data to assign status scores to the same list of occupations dealt with by Duncan. By applying the same procedure to the 1950 census data they made it possible to examine changes in status of occupations during a ten year interval. The correlation of .97 between the two scales indicates a high degree of stability in the relative status of occupations between 1950 and 1960. The key factors identified by Nam and Powers, those which may lead to changes in relative status of occupations, include the number and age of persons in a particular occupation as well as their education and income. Even though they discovered 92 occupations whose score differed by at least ten points (four were higher and 88 were lower) the relative stability of occupational status during this ten year period was apparent.

A study similar in design to the NORC study of occupational prestige reported by Hodge, et al. (1964) was replicated in Canada by Pineo and Porter (1967:62). Essentially it was a comparative study of occupational status involving the United States which provided some empirical justification for the criticism that sociologists have made "of the way in which occupations have been treated in the Canadian census."

The work of Inkeles and Rossi (1956) provided an international comparison of occupational ranks by synthesizing data from various studies carried out in six different countries. These investigators discovered an unusually high consensus among the nations examined regarding the ranking of common occupations.

Measuring Occupational Prestige

Since occupational prestige refers to the subjective evaluations that people hold of occupations there appears to be a widespread belief that it is more difficult to measure than occupational status. Generally, attempts to measure occupational prestige have concentrated on obtaining the opinions of representative or random samples of the adult population to locate particular occupations on a ranking scale. In cases where sociological literature refers to investigations of occupational prestige that employ such procedures as studies of occupational status, some confusion is created. Increased usage in research literature of the term "prestige status", during the past decade may be the result of an attempt to avoid this problem. Inter-occupational studies which involve the ranking of teachers are both numerous and varied; however, the intra-occupational counterparts of these have received relatively little attention in the past.

Relevant research indicates that most of the studies in occupational stratification have focused on the prestige dimension and that many seem to suffer from a variety of weaknesses. Davies (1962:255-256) discusses the limitations of prestige scales as research instruments by revealing three classes of doubts which question their usefulness:

1. Doubts concerning the public nature of the recognition of occupational prestige particularly the one suggesting that judgments of the prestige of occupations will vary notably with the social status or social class position of informants.
2. Doubts concerned with the possibility of different types of "recognition" of prestige differences. Occupations closer to informants will be more meaningful.
3. Doubts which call into question the singleness of the hierarchy of different occupations.

The last observation made by Davies (1962:256) is pertinent to this study in view of his interpretation of Hatt's suggestion which maintains that "meaningful comparisons of prestige can only be made for occupations within certain organically related groups", consequently "comparisons between such groups ('subhierarchies') will lack the sureness and thus the legitimacy of intragroup comparisons."

Davies (1962) claims that the simple ranking studies which form the bulk of empirical literature on occupational prestige have failed to produce a totally acceptable scale for measuring the prestige of occupations. Questionable rating and sampling techniques employed by researchers add to the skepticism about the usefulness of the method of inquiry pursued to construct a "publicly recognized" occupational prestige "hierarchy." The answer may reside in approaches which focus on an intra-occupational perspective.

Empirical Studies of Occupational Prestige

With some modifications the selective review of studies which follows parallels the account presented by Davies (1962:256-261). The purpose of this review is to reveal developmental trends and some of the conclusions reached about occupational prestige.

Counts (1925:16-27), was among the first to develop an occupational prestige scale. He asked 450 students and teachers to rank 45 occupations which included all the main levels of the teaching profession. In seeking to determine the comparative standing of this group of occupations he found agreement on the placing of particular occupations to be greatest for those occupations which were ranked lowest. Generally, he found a high degree of agreement among respondents in ranking all occupations. Teacher evaluations were found to be more consistent than those of students.

Studies by Neiz (1935:454-461) and Deeg and Paterson (1947:237-241) replicated Count's study by utilizing shortened versions of his list for asking college students to rank selected occupations. Both studies were concerned with discovering differences in rankings over a period of time, and both found no marked changes at all about occupational prestige over the intervals dealt with. Niez (1935) did conclude that the "depression" had little effect on changing the social status of occupations.

Two studies by Anderson (1927 and 1934) reported the relation between notions of social prestige, social contribution and economic return. Both studies used college students to rank 25 occupations. In the earlier study he found rankings by social contribution to be fairly similar to those obtained for social prestige by Counts. The later study found social prestige to be more closely related to economic return than social prestige to social contribution or social contribution to economic return.

Hartman's study (1934:144-152) used judges from various fields of endeavour to rank 25 occupations for the main purpose of determining the status of teachers. In addition to confirming the previously established ranking pattern the study produced little evidence of "marked egocentricism."

Coutu (1936:522-530) reported findings on 20 professions which revealed that each group chose its own profession as the most important and selected a different one as second choice. Why these particular findings are so contrary to their counterparts reported by Hartman is unclear. According to Coutu, there were striking disagreements in the placement of particular professions and marked differences in the closeness of agreement within groups.

In 1941, Osgood and Stagner (1941:275-290) attempted to identify some of the qualities associated with occupational prestige. Their major finding showed few high correlations between traits associated with people in particular occupations and general prestige, the highest being for "brains", "leadership", "excitingness" and "self-assuredness."

The study by Cattel (1942:293-308) examined the extent of agreement in ranking occupations by prestige. Twenty-six occupations were ranked by a group of college students and group of labourers. The results showed close agreement between the two groups but notable differences within the labourer group. Students regarded "real estate dealer", "cashier", and "accountant" as more important than did labourers, while labourers ranked "manager of business" and "works foreman" much higher than did the student group. Familiarity with occupation was posed as a possible reason for these differences.

A rather ambitious plan for developing a prestige scale was undertaken by Smith (1943:185-192). In his attempt to develop an idea which would lead to the building up of a complete occupational scale he put forth a proposal to erect equally spaced and solidly placed occupations which would serve for all time as a sorting device for processing sample lists of occupations. The problem associated with guaranteeing the equality of different groups of subjects during such a systematic repetition of tests apparently has proven to be insurmountable.

In 1946, the National Opinion Research Centre employed a national adult sample for obtaining the first indication on record of how Americans view occupations. One year later a further NORC survey (1949:Ch. XIII) questioned 2,920 persons representing a cross-section of the American population. A total of 90 occupations were rated and later sorted into five prestige categories according to a scoring scheme that averaged the ratings of all respondents for each occupation. The average score obtained by an occupation (possible range was a high of 100 to a low of 20, and actual range from 96 to 33) determined its category as: "excellent", "good", "average", "somewhat below average", or "poor." Although four-fifths of the occupations were ranked average or above, all the occupational categories were fairly well represented. The finding considered to be outstanding was the identical prestige rating accorded to white-collar and skilled manual workers.

The 1947 NORC study was replicated by Hodge and associates (1964:286-302) in 1963 on a national sample of 615 persons to determine the degree of stability and change in occupational prestige. The correlation between the 1963 and 1947 prestige scores was .99 indicating virtually no change in occupational prestige over this period. According to Pavalko (1971:140) "this scale remains the single best measure of occupational prestige in the United States."

In his appraisal of research findings on this subject Davies (1962:262-267) emphasizes two conclusions for the guidance of future investigators in this field:

1. Evidence has not been forthcoming to support the suspicion that differences in region and occupational level of informants are relevant to their judgments of the prestige of occupations. However, the tests have shown:
    - (a) there is more agreement among members of some groups about the rankings they produce than there is among certain other groups,
    - (b) people are more certain about placing occupations in the higher and lower extremes than in the middle range of status and,
    - (c) though the consensus typically reported supports the use of the model of a single public to rank occupations, only a list of occupations confined to a particular sector of the public can examine margins of disagreement.
2. The simple ranking method has not been very successful in revealing important differences about occupational prestige which may exist both across and within respondent groups.

By comparing the results of the 1947 and 1963 NORC studies with the Nam and Power's analysis of occupational status for 1950 and 1960, Pavalko (1971:140) concludes,

> Despite changes in the income and educational attainment associated with occupations, the way in which they are publicly perceived and evaluated does not seem to reflect these changes. Rather there tends to be a lag between changes in status and the perception of prestige with the result that occupational prestige tends to be more stable over time than occupational status.

Taylor's comments on occupational prestige provide a fitting summary for the review presented. Taylor (1968:177) concludes,

> ... the measurement of occupational prestige is far from absolute. Nevertheless, the evidence which is available both nationally and internationally suggests that in urbanized and industrialized societies the occupational prestige hierarchy has been relatively stable in the mid-twentieth century.

It is apparent from the preceding discussion that a high degree of consensus has emerged regarding the relative stability of the occupational prestige hierarchy over the past four decades.

The Status of Teachers

The concern over the status of teachers is reflected in much of the research on occupational stratification. Despite this interest many studies have tended to treat "teacher" as a unified occupational category by failing to recognize some obvious distinctions between different kinds of teaching in the occupational lists used.

Counts (1925) separated teaching into different ranks such as college professor, school superintendent, elementary teacher, high school teacher and rural school teacher and found that each of the teaching occupations appeared above the mid-point in the list of 45 rated. He concluded that teaching could not be regarded as a unitary occupation.

The 1947 NORC study (1949) revealed a high order of agreement between different occupations on the ranking of teachers. There was evident more consensus on the ranking of teachers than similarly ranked occupations. A wide disparity in the ranking of teachers by the different age groups was not found to be the case for other occupations rated. Of the age group 14 to 20, 59 percent gave "good" or "excellent" ratings to the occupation of teacher while 78 percent of the 40 and over age group gave these ratings. "The inability of the younger people to recognize the importance of education at an individual and societal level", is the explanation offered by Bernbaum and associates (1970:45) for these findings of the NORC study.

Most of the status studies previously referred to have emphasized the marked stability of the rank ordering of occupations over time. The teacher's position has remained virtually uniform even across the six nations surveyed by Inkeles and Rossi (1956). One notable exception is the work of Groff (1962) who attempted to compare the ranking of teaching as an occupation through an analysis of American studies undertaken between 1931 and 1958. The nature and extent of the differences Groff discovered are reported in Table 2 which is reproduced from his work. The data reported by Groff suggest that the stability of teaching over time has been somewhat questionable and that the relative status of High School teachers compared to Elementary School teachers may not be what is often suspected.

The repeat of the NORC study carried out by Hodge and associates (1964) in 1963 saw the category "public school teacher" elevated from position 36 in 1947 to position 29 in 1963 despite the remarkable degree of agreement reported between the two studies. A correlation of .99 was reported for the two sets of ranked scores.

In two related studies carried out in Britain, Hall and Jones (1950)

Table 2

Judged Rank Order of Teaching Among Other Occupations

	Elementary School Teachers		High School Teachers	
	Rank	No. of Occupations	Rank	No. of Occupations
1931 - Lehrman				
(Girl judges)	10	200	28	200
(Boy judges)	50	200	66	200
1932 - Menger	4	35	5	35
1934 - Hartman	5	12	6	12
	8	25	11	25
	7	25	9	25
1934 - Anderson	('School Teacher')			
	11	25		
1935 - Duncan	('Teaching')			
	3	38		
1935 - Nietz	9	40	11	40
1939 - Ruch	('School Teacher')			
	12	25		
1940 - Stevens	('Teacher')			
	10	25		
1947 - NORC	('Instructor in the Public Schools')			
	35	90		
1947 - Deeg			8	25
1948 - Best	('Teaching')			
(Men judges)	4	15		
(Women judges)	5	15		
1948 - Baudler	6	29	11	29
1949 - Welch	6	26	8	26
1951 - Richey	5	18	6	18
1958 - Tuckman			6	15
	('When job description added')			
			4	15

Source: P.J. Groff - Journal of Educational Sociology, Sept. 1962, p. 21, as reproduced in G. Bernbaum, G. Noble and M.T. Whiteside, 1970, p. 46.

report that teachers (only elementary teacher was listed) placed tenth in their list of 30 occupations. Gerstl and Cohen (1964) had a national sample and a group of engineers rank a list of ten professions. Primary teacher was rated ninth by the general public and received tenth position from the engineers.

Intra-Occupational Prestige Studies

In 1955, a study on the differential prestige among school superintendents was reported by Mason and Gross (1955:326-331). A stratified random sample of superintendents' positions was used as the basis for gathering data from a group of superintendents who were asked to register their feelings about a move from present position to each of the others described in the questionnaire. Feelings on each of the positions were obtained by use of a five category scale ranging from a great gain to a great loss in professional standing. Judgments about criteria used by superintendents to evaluate their job were solicited and these criteria turned out to be: facilities, professional quality, responsibility and salary. Salary was found to be the best indicator and the most reliable measure of prestige. This study of hierarchy within this specific occupation served to illustrate that differential prestige is a basis for determining hierarchies in education.

Louis Kriesberg (1962:238-244) reported the findings of a study concerned with the occupational prestige of dentists. Findings indicated that the relationship between such attitudes as those having to do with importance of the work performed and their prestige was not impressive. Rather, high prestige was awarded in cases where respondents believed that all professionals obtained high prestige and that dentists belonged to this group. Taylor (1968) implies that the results of this research indicate occupational prestige may be attributed more by situs of occupational families than by the perception of individual occupational practitioners.

A study of male nurses in a Boston hospital was carried out in 1962 by Segal (1962:31-38). Male nurses were compared with their female counterparts regarding their attitudes on intra-hospital status and their status outside the hospital. The findings suggested that male nurses were marginal men whose prestige was precarious due to their inability to adjust to a female role and to identify with other professionals.

A study which dealt more with prestige differentiation in a specific situation than prestige attributed to a particular professional practitioner was reported in 1963 by Gamson and Schuman (1963:463-479). The findings revealed considerable disparity between the prestige given to physicians and the raters' attitudes about their occupation. It was discovered that regardless of the raters' judgment about the behaviour of physicians a high prestige was assigned to them even in some cases where considerable hostility was manifested toward them. It was suggested that high prestige may result from a perception of medical roles in general, or respondents may not react to differential standards of role performance.

Bernbaum and associates (1970:48-51) carried out an empirical investigation in 1969 designed to find out whether prospective teachers still perceive intra-occupational prestige differences. The Hall-Jones scale of 30 occupations with the position of teacher removed was employed to obtain information from 198 prospective teachers regarding two questions: (1) where they thought the public would place each of six specified teaching positions and then (2) where they themselves would place the same positions. Tables 3 and 4 display the results obtained.

Table 3

Students' Perceptions of General Public's Ranking

		Standard Deviation
Primary School Teacher	12.4	3.52
Secondary Modern School Teacher	11.4	3.31
Independent School Teacher	7.5	2.67
Comprehensive School Teacher	9.8	2.91
'Maintained Grammar School Teacher'	7.6	2.35
Assistant Lecturer in College of Further Education	6.4	2.84

Source: Bernbaum, et al. European Yearbook of Educational Research, 1969, p. 49.

Table 4

Mean Scores of Students' Own Ranking

		Standard Deviation
Primary School Teacher	7.9	3.47
Secondary Modern School Teacher	7.7	3.09
Independent School Teacher	7.6	3.97
Comprehensive School Teacher	6.6	2.78
Maintained Grammar School Teacher	6.5	2.71
Assistant Lecturer in College of Further Education	5.9	2.79

Source: European Yearbook of Educational Research, 1969, p. 49.

The findings indicate the overall tendency of teachers to place their chosen profession above what they perceived the likely rating of the general public to be. Noteworthy was the finding which revealed that the highest mean score given any teaching position (5.9) would not place the teacher with professions on the scale like accountant or solicitor. For the investigators, the most surprising finding was the high prestige the respondents accorded the Assistant Lecturer and their perception of his public prestige. The findings of Bernbaum and associates (1970:51) also reveal,

> ... no significant correlations were obtained between the prestige rankings and the social origins of the students as measured by their parents' occupations, nor between the rankings of such variables as sex, type of school attended, type of university attended or class of degree.

Humphreys (1970:1-22) reported a study which was primarily concerned with examining the differential prestige of teachers teaching at the same level but in different subject-matter fields. Data were obtained from 426 randomly selected Ontario secondary teachers who rated 75 teaching positions on a prestige status scale. The findings suggest that a prestige hierarchy based upon the subjects a teacher teaches exists in the Secondary schools of Ontario. Evidence revealed that academic teaching positions ranked highest in prestige followed by commercial and technical positions.

The finding of particular relevance to this study is the variation in value of prestige rankings (range was from a high of 1.88 to a low of 8.17) which illustrates that teachers are accorded different prestige by other teachers.

In a later study reported by Humphreys (1970:1-25) which was an outgrowth of the first, a similar sample of teachers was used for rating the titles of seven occupational groups on a seven position semantic differential using nine scales. The data provided information about attitudes teachers hold of teaching colleagues in their own and in other groups.

The findings indicated that academic teachers think of technical teachers as being more like skilled workers than professional persons. However, the hypothesis that this group would conceive of commercial teachers as being more like white collar workers was not supported. As might be expected, the technical teacher saw himself as being more like a professional than a skilled labourer and both technical and commercial teachers viewed the commercial teacher as being more like a professional person than a white collar worker. Probably the most important finding was the relation which existed between the type of teacher and the concepts he held of colleagues in his own and other groups when he was asked to judge a single generalized concept of a teacher type such as Senior High School teacher rather than to rank him on a prestige scale listing the specific titles (Art teacher, Science teacher, etc.) associated with type.

Bases of Stratification

The literature on this subject is replete with examples to show that the occupational structure is not an absolutely or clearly ordered status continuum. Much less certainty exists about the nature of the prestige hierarchies which exist within particular occupations like teaching.

The five features of stratification which emerge from Tumin's discussion (1967:12-18) on this topic are: its essential social character; its ambiguity; its ubiquitousness; its diversity; and its consequentiality. Tumin (1967:19) explains status differentiation as "the process by which social positions like ... teacher ... are defined and distinguished from one another by assigning to each a distinctive role...."

In addition, Tumin (1967:19) suggests that although there are numerous criteria on which social statuses could be ranked only some are employed in the ranking process. The others receive little or no consideration. In the ranking of jobs, educational prerequisites, requirements of intelligence and skills, and difficulty of performance, have received considerable emphasis. The extent to which persons belonging to particular occupational groups possess the criteria being considered is often difficult to measure objectively but an assessment can be made in terms of more or less, or higher or lower.

The two major ways in which individuals and groups may acquire status is through assignment by some external source or by acquiring a position by means of individual or group effort.

Lieberman (1956:452) maintains that every person has "... a place in the prestige system of his society", which is determined by many factors besides occupation. He identifies some of the bases for ascribing status to a person as "... occupation, wealth, appearance, race, religion, age and talent." In stressing the importance of the status of one's occupation to the individual Lieberman (1956:543) emphasizes the cruciality of recognizing that status cannot be equated with occupation or personal worth when he says, "Ignorance of the requirements of occupations and of the gradations within them lead people to react toward each other on the basis of occupational type."

Of particular significance to this study is Lieberman's statement (1956:543) pointing out that,

> ... skill differences between members of the same occupational group may be a more important influence upon the status of the individuals in the group than the status of the group as a whole.

Some of the comments made by Tumin (1967:84-86) are offered in this study as explanation and justification for the selection of criteria made to investigate stratification within the teaching profession. Besides recognizing the many complexities and problems associated with studies of stratification he maintains that the number and kinds of criteria employed to distinguish strata depends on the conception held of classes and their composition, of what is considered as cause and of what is treated as outcome or result. He contends that there are many approaches to the study of stratification and many ways to justify each approach in spite of the advantages and disadvantages inherent in them. The three criteria Tumin (1967:20) proposes as the basis for ranking statuses for the purpose of making comparisons are:

1. Personal characteristics believed to be required.
2. Trained skills and abilities believed to be required.
3. Consequences or effects upon others of the performance of the status role.

It is generally recognized and accepted that there are numerous other factors which may have an influence on the way in which teachers perceive prestige hierarchies in their occupation. Awareness of this possibility required that the investigator select, thoughtfully, a number of characteristics which would in his opinion constitute the most appropriate set for investigating the research problem.

THE NATURE AND MEASUREMENT OF ATTITUDES

Although there seems to be little apparent agreement in social psychology about the precise definition of attitudes a common core of agreement has emerged. Stern (1963:404) lists the four fundamental points of agreement about defining attitudes which indicate that they are:

(1) socially formed, (2) orientations toward others and toward objects, (3) selective, (4) reflective of a disposition to an activity, not a verbalization. The basic difference in definitions of attitudes seems to be that some are directed toward the nature of the concept while others are directed toward its measurement.

Zimbardo and Ebbsen (1969:6-7) observe that "attitudes have generally been regarded as either mental readiness or implicit predispositions which exert some general and consistent influence on a fairly large class of evaluative responses, "... responses which are "... usually directed toward some object, person or group." Attitudes in their view are also seen as enduring, learned predispositions which are susceptible to change and as "states" which exist inside the person to exert behaviour.

Many of the references which deal with this topic list affect, cognition, and behaviour as the three components which characterize attitudes. These sources propose that the affective component consisting of a person's evaluation of some object, person, or group may be measured by verbal statements of like and dislike. Since it is this particular aspect of attitude measurement which is pertinent to the problem being investigated, the study has been confined to an examination of relationships on attitudes of professionalism between and among specified teacher groups. Such groups are perceived by teachers as possessing varying amounts of prestige and consequently differing relative statuses (high or low) on particular characteristics or combinations of them.

THE CONCEPTS OF STATUS CONGRUENCE AND STATUS INCONGRUENCE

Although the concepts of status congruence and status incongruence have been explained by several sociologists including Homans (1961:268) and Malewski (1966:303) there does not appear to be at the present time any universally accepted definitions of these terms. In order to investigate the nature of certain attitudinal relationships among teachers who possessed specified combinations of positional and professional characteristics, it was necessary to develop appropriate definitions for these terms and a classification model which would facilitate the inquiry. According to the definitions of status congruence and status incongruence presented in Chapter I, the status of a teacher would be either congruent or incongruent depending on the particular combination of specified positional and professional characteristics he possessed. The classification model presented in Figure 1 illustrates the status factors which were used to derive the status congruent and status incongruent teacher groups from the sample of respondents.

	Professional Status Factors	
Positional Status Factors	High Status	Low Status
High Status	Status Congruent (Hi - Hi)	Status Incongruent (Hi - Lo)
Low Status	Status Incongruent (Lo - Hi)	Status Congruent (Lo - Lo)

Figure 1

Status Congruency-Incongruency Classification Model

Malewski (1966:303) points out that the concept of status incongruence can be useful,

> ... in the analysis of differences in the behaviour of different categories of individuals and differences in relations between people depending on the degree of congruence of the status factors.

In accordance with the definition he has suggested, Malewski (1966:305-308) presents seven propositions concerning the consequences of status incongruence. Some of these beliefs may have relevance for teachers experiencing the condition of status incongruence according to the meaning of the concept adopted for this study.

HYPOTHESES

The approach adopted for this study reflects an attempt to examine the relative status of teachers from a perspective which takes into account the results of technological and social change. A position was taken similar to the one advanced by Bernbaum, et al. (1970). This position holds that other, possibly more important bases for inferring the prestige rank of teaching and of various categories of teachers who comprise the occupation may exist. Essentially, this posture questions the validity of those approaches used in the past which have ranked teachers without making adequate distinctions between the different types and classifications of teachers comprising the profession. In some respects this approach reflects the same interests as those expressed by authorities such as Blishen (1964), Etzioni (1968) and Lortie (1968) in investigating matters related to the status of teaching. Blishen (1964) developed an occupational scale based on the 1951 Canadian census which revealed status differences between several classifications of male and female teachers. Professionalization of teaching has been discussed by Etzioni (1968). Lortie (1968) presented an article concerned with the relative status of Elementary teachers. By examining the nature and degree of teacher perceived stratification within the profession according to sets of associated positional, professional and personal characteristics, and by determining attitudinal relationships on attributes of professionalism between and among specified status groupings, it was assumed that empirical evidence would emerge to reveal more clearly the internal structure of this particular occupation.

An underlying purpose of this study may be described as an attempt to reconfirm, empirically, a finding reported by Counts (1925) almost a half century ago. Results of his research established that "teaching" could not be considered a unitary occupational category.

The following constitute the hypotheses tested in this study:

Hypothesis 1.1: There are significant differences in the amounts of prestige which teachers in general attribute to subgroups classified according to the specified positional characteristics.

Hypothesis 1.2: There are significant differences in the amounts of prestige which major teacher sub-groupings attribute to subgroups classified according to the specified positional characteristics.

Hypothesis 2.1: There are significant differences in the amounts of prestige which teachers in general attribute to subgroups on the basis of the professional characteristics of teaching experience, qualifications, teaching level and official ATA office held.

Hypothesis 2.2: There are significant differences in the amounts of prestige which selected teacher groupings attribute to subgroups classified on the basis of the professional characteristics of teaching experience, qualifications, teaching level and official ATA office held.

Hypothesis 3.1: There are significant differences in the amounts of prestige which teachers in general attribute to subgroups classified on the basis of the personal characteristics of age, sex and place of professional preparation.

Hypothesis 3.2: There are significant differences in the amounts of prestige which selected teacher groupings attribute to subgroups classified on the basis of the personal characteristics of age, sex and place of professional preparation.

Hypothesis 4: There are significant differences in the importance which teachers attribute to selected personal and professional characteristics as determinants of prestige.

Hypothesis 5.1: The attitudes of high and low prestige teacher groups classified on the basis of specified positional characteristics differ significantly on the dimensions of professionalism.

Hypothesis 5.2: The attitudes of high and low prestige teacher groups classified on the basis of teaching level, experience, qualifications, and official ATA office held differ significantly on the dimensions of professionalism.

Hypothesis 5.3: The attitudes of high and low prestige teacher groups classified on the basis of age, sex and place of professional preparation differ significantly on the dimensions of professionalsim.

Hypothesis 5.4: The attitudes of high and low prestige teacher groups classified on the basis of combinations of positional, professional and personal characteristics differ significantly on the dimensions of professionalism.

Hypothesis 6: The attitudes of status congruent and status incongruent teacher groupings classified on the basis of selected positional and professional factors differ significantly on the dimensions of professionalism.

SUMMARY

The abundance of literature on the professions exhibits great diversity in the approaches adopted by the various writers in defining and detailing the criteria of a profession. Nevertheless, it does illustrate the consensus which has emerged among these writers about basic dimensions which are generally descriptive of professions. The "process" approach developed by Bucher and Strauss was stressed as being the most appropriate analytical orientation for investigating those aspects of the teaching profession selected for examination.

The concepts of occupational status and occupational prestige were reviewed in a context applicable to their interpretation and use in this study. The development and use of a number of the prominent scales and schemes devised to measure occupational status suggests the continuing interest which has characterized this field of endeavour. However, there has been a variety of problems and limitations encountered by unsuccessful attempts to construct a "publicly recognized" occupational prestige "hierarchy." Developmental trends and some of the conclusions reached about occupational prestige can be ascertained from the findings presented by prominent empirical studies on the subject. Evidence from this research seems to support two conclusions which indicate that the measurement of occupational prestige is still far from absolute and the apparent stability of the occupational prestige hierarchy has not changed appreciably during the mid-twentieth century.

Some status studies of teachers emphasize the marked stability of the position of teacher over time and across nations while others report contrary findings. The contrary findings are often reported in those cases where "teacher" has not been treated as a unified occupational category.

Interest in conducting studies concerned specifically with intra-occupational prestige problems has been lacking. The most significant findings to be reported by the research available in this area suggest that teachers tend to place their occupation above what they perceive the public ranking would be, but not high enough to correspond with rankings of occupations that place at the upper end of a prestige scale. Humphreys' studies show that teachers are accorded differential prestige by other teachers. His findings reveal that teachers ranked academic teaching positions highest with commercial and technical teaching positions following in that order.

There appears to be a great deal of uncertainty about the bases of stratification. Evidence from the literature on this topic suggests that there are numerous criteria on which statuses could be ranked. Perhaps the reason that some have received more emphasis than others is the possibility of achieving more objective measures for some criteria than for others. It seems that the practice which has been followed by the researcher in this field was to select criteria which could be justified by the particular approach to stratification that he chose to take.

A common core of agreement seems to have emerged regarding the nature and measurement of attitudes. Generally, attitudes have been regarded as either mental readiness or predispositions which exert influence on a large class of evaluative responses usually directed at some object, person or group. It has been proposed that the affective component of attitudes which consists of a person's evaluation of individuals and groups can be measured by verbal statements of like and dislike. Statements of this type were used in the Attitude Scales constructed for this study.

The concepts of status congruence and status incongruence developed for the purpose of this study are concerned with the classification of teachers according to the particular combination of specified positional and professional characteristics which they possess. This procedure made it possible for the selected attitudes of professionalism held by teacher groupings classified in this manner to be determined and compared.

CHAPTER III

INSTRUMENTATION

The data required for testing the hypotheses advanced for this study were collected by means of five specially prepared instruments. These were assembled to constitute a single document comprising an inventory of teacher perceptions and attitudes on matters pertinent to the investigation, and on personal-educational identification information. Essentially, a four part questionnaire was designed to provide the required background information on each respondent in the research sample, (Part A) teacher perceived measures of prestige on selected positional, personal and professional characteristics (Part B) and attitudinal measures on selected dimensions of professionalism (Parts C and D). This chapter describes the sequence of events and the procedures which were followed during each stage in the development of the instruments included in the questionnaire entitled Prestige Differentials Within the Alberta Teaching Force: An Inventory of Member Perceptions and Attitudes. An original copy of the questionnaire containing the instruments used in the main study is included as Appendix A.

INITIAL DEVELOPMENT

The original questionnaire designed for this study consisted of three parts. Part A included an instrument prepared to obtain personal-educational data on characteristics descriptive of the respondent. Instruments designed to obtain prestige measures on positional, professional and personal characteristics were included in Part B and a 47 item

Teacher Attitude Inventory was contained in Part C. A sample copy of the instrument is included in Appendix B.

Personal-Educational Information Instrument

This instrument was constructed especially for this study. Originally, it consisted of 15 "fixed alternative" type items designed to provide specific information on the personal, professional and positional characteristics of the respondents. Data obtained from this source enabled the classification of respondents according to the teacher subgroups identified in the body of the prestige scales included in Part B of the original inventory. This procedure was necessary to permit testing of the hypotheses involving these subgroups. Since it was expected that the nature of the information requested would be very familiar to every respondent and that it would be stated accurately, it was considered that the responses obtained would yield valid and reliable data. The original questionnaire solicited the following information:

1. Age, sex and marital status
2. Years of teaching experience
3. Type of school unit served e.g. County, City Public, etc.
4. Professional preparation (years of teacher education and degrees held)
5. Major job assignment according to teaching and/or administrative duties, grade level and position held in the school
6. Grade organization of the school (e.g. 1-12, 7-9) and size of staff e.g. 11-20, etc.
7. Population of school centre e.g. City - over 100,000, etc.
8. Field of specialization (e.g. Fine Arts) and number of university courses completed in this specialization

Positional Characteristics Prestige Rating Scale

The original version of this rating scale consisted of a list of 18 occupational groups classified on the basis of the position group members held in the school. To ensure that the classification list adopted for this scale would be comprehensive enough to include categories covering the total range of teaching, administrative, supervisory and special functions performed in Alberta schools, it was checked against similar lists employed by Ratsoy (1970:94) and The Alberta Teachers' Association (1972:22) to survey positional characteristics of the total Alberta Teaching Force. Essentially, the instrument was designed to obtain perceived measures of prestige from each respondent in the sample for each of the 18 occupational subgroups designated on the scale. Respondent estimates recorded on the Likert-type interval scale provided the data required for establishing the positional prestige hierarchy presently existing within the Alberta teaching force according to the perceptions of the total sample, various positional subgroups and combinations of these subgroups.

Professional-Personal Characteristics Prestige Rating Scale

Each of the seven separate sections comprising the original instrument contained a list of variables associated with the particular professional or personal characteristics that each section identified. Sections 2, 3, 5, and 7 were designed to obtain data on the four professional characteristics of teaching level, teaching qualifications, teaching experience and official ATA office held. Sections 1, 4 and 6 were concerned with the three personal characteristics of sex, age and place of professional preparation. The basis for selecting the professional and personal characteristics included in this instrument was a survey of the related research and literature. What was deemed to be a manageable number of factors for each part of the instrument was selected from a list of those mentioned most frequently in the related literature. The "ATA official office held" characteristic is an exception. Teacher subgroup categories listed for each characteristic were created to conform to appropriate clusterings of teachers which are known to exist within the Alberta teaching force. The related scale used for evaluating each item of each characteristic was identical in nature to the rating device designed for the Positional Prestige Rating Scale described earlier.

Teacher Attitude Inventory

The original version of this instrument contained a total of 47 items. Forty-five of these items dealt with matters related to support of the professional organization, its major policies and practices and matters associated with job satisfaction of the individual teacher. Items 46 and 47 were developed to obtain measures of feelings concerned with the concept of relative deprivation. A five-point Likert-type rating scale was used to obtain the degree of agreement or disagreement of the respondent on each inventory item. Ideas for several of the items included in this instrument were obtained from similar instruments developed by Ingram (1965) and others.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE PILOT STUDY INVENTORY

The original instruments which have been described were submitted to a panel of ten educators for critical review. On the basis of their recommendations substantial changes to each instrument were made and incorporated into the inventory prepared for the pilot study. Since these changes were numerous and extensive they are not reported here in detail. However, the nature of the modifications mentioned can be observed by comparing the two inventories which are included as Appendix B. Modifications of directions, format, wording of some items and additions of items were completed for the pilot version. The instruments used in the "field tryout" were deemed to have face and construct validity as a result of the refinements which were made according to the recommendations of the evaluation panel.

PILOT STUDY

In order to obtain reliable evidence and data for improving the validity and reliability of the instruments involved and the adequacy of the personal-educational data inventory, the pilot project was carefully planned.

Pilot Sample

Permission to contact authorities representing the three school jurisdictions involved was obtained from the Field Experiences Division of the Faculty of Education. After securing each superintendent's approval to contact the principals involved arrangements were finalized with these personnel for participation by their respective teacher staffs. Four schools representative of all grade levels, rural, urban, and rural-urban settings, and organized to serve students at the Elementary School, Elementary-Junior, Junior-Senior and Senior High School levels were selected. The distribution of the 131 teacher participants by school was a follows: County of Parkland Elementary School (grades 1 to 6) 31 teachers; Edmonton Roman Catholic School District Elementary-Junior High

School (grades 1 to 9) 30 teachers; County of Strathcona Junior-Senior High School (grades 7 to 12) 32 teachers and the County of Parkland Senior High School (grades 10 to 12) 38 teachers. Brief contact was made with two of the four staffs to outline the nature and purpose of the pilot study.

Administration of the Teacher Questionnaire

Copies of the questionnaire prepared for the pilot sample (see Appendix B) were delivered to the participating schools on October 12 and 13, 1972. Each questionnaire was accompanied by a letter of request to teachers containing all the additional directions deemed necessary. (See Appendix B) The principals involved collected, for pick-up, 108 completed questionnaires representing a return of 82.4 percent. The lowest return from a school was 77 percent and the highest 88 percent. Each staff was formally thanked for its assistance following the termination date set for each school.

REVISIONS

Analysis of Pilot Study Data

Personal-Educational Data Section. Several changes in format, wording and content were indicated as a result of comments received and inadequacies noted. To obtain the required data for this study it was discovered that two additional items were needed to provide information on the source of first teaching certificate and the ATA office(s) held by respondents. Representativeness of the pilot sample was checked and found to be satisfactory on a number of important characteristics.

Intra-Occupational Rating Scales Section. Results of the analysis of data indicated that the directions provided for the positional, professional and personal characteristics instruments needed further clarification. Revisions to the rating scale headings were required in several instances. Needed changes in the wording of items and format were apparent. Distributions of respondents' ratings were examined for each item of each scale and it was determined that the six rating levels provided an adequate range of measures to obtain teacher estimates of prestige attributed to the various items. The analysis indicated the necessity for extending this section to include a separate scale for evaluating the relative importance of the seven professional and personal characteristics to be considered.

Teacher Attitude Inventory Section. The analysis of relevant data suggested that in general, participants experienced no difficulty in responding to the 45 attitude items. Items 46 and 47 were deleted since they proved to be unsatisfactory for the sample tested. Distribution of respondents' scores obtained for each of the attitude items indicated that the discriminatory power of the rating scale was acceptable. This did not occur for items 46 and 47 as a high percentage of the scores appeared at the mid-point of the rating scale. Several negative comments about these two items were received from the respondents along with some suggestions for changes in the wording of other items.

Selection of Attitude Items. Pertinent data obtained from the pilot study were subjected to a statistical treatment generally known as the Principal Components Method of the factor analytic technique. Essentially, this approach is designed to reduce a table of intercorrelations to a set of one or more factors. Frost (1967:146) describes factor analysis as "a method of condensing a larger number of items in the original analysis into a smaller number of hypothetical tests." Frost (1967:148) explains the Principal Components Method as,

> ... a way of breaking down a correlation matrix into a set of orthogonal components or axes equal in number to the number of variates concerned. These correspond to the eigenvalues (latent roots) and accompanying latent vectors of the matrix. These roots are extracted in descending order of magnitude.

In this method of analysis it is assumed that items correlate because of an underlying functional relationship. Each component in the matrix is identified by a set of loadings for the original ~~variables~~. To achieve an "easily interpretable" structure, the varimax orthogonal rotation was selected in accordance with the discussions of Crawford and Ferguson (1969) on the topic.

Table 5 presents the results of the factor analysis method applied to the data obtained from the 45 items included in the pilot version of the Teacher Attitude Scale. On the basis of the analysis reported in Table 5 a Teacher Attitude Inventory was developed which consisted of the ten highest loading items appearing under factor one (the factor designated to identify support items). Since the analysis did not produce a sufficient number of items dealing with specified matters of association policy and practice and job satisfaction, it was decided to exclude these from the study and use a revised version of the professionalism inventory developed by Hall (1969) to examine attitudes of professionalism held by selected groupings of teachers. Details of the modifications made to the original Hall instrument are presented in a subsequent section of this chapter.

Table 5

Principal-Axis With a Varimax Rotation Factor Solution for the Pilot Study Version of the Teacher Attitude Scale

	Factor Loadings of Items on Factors					Communalities
Item	1	2	3	4	5	
1	0.147	-0.005	-0.025	0.029	0.539*	0.314
2	0.102	0.155	0.441*	0.008	-0.035	0.230
3	-0.119	-0.491*	-0.238	0.387	0.106	0.473
4	0.134	0.303*	0.139	0.004	-0.378	0.272
5	0.552*	0.222	0.025	0.321	0.003	0.458
6	0.134	-0.215	0.382*	0.066	0.093	0.223
7	-0.058	0.004	0.430*	0.077	-0.167	0.222
8	0.767*	0.221	0.193	-0.017	-0.092	0.684
9	0.375*	0.266	0.139	0.301	0.220	0.370
10	0.273	-0.004	0.064	0.531*	-0.034	0.361
11	0.180	0.495*	0.136	-0.051	0.115	0.312
12	0.654*	0.256	0.098	0.016	-0.094	0.513
13	-0.058	0.527*	0.166	0.021	0.379	0.453
14	0.694*	0.067	-0.198	0.073	0.077	0.536
15	0.083	0.512*	-0.310	0.226	0.195	0.454
16	0.437*	-0.086	0.193	0.404	0.222	0.448
17	0.267	-0.077	-0.051	0.145	-0.295*	0.188
18	-0.264	0.253	0.465*	0.030	-0.098	0.361
19	0.644*	0.110	0.320	0.151	0.166	0.580
20	0.681*	-0.010	0.021	-0.051	-0.123	0.482
21	0.178	0.050	0.047	0.607*	-0.135	0.423
22	-0.051	0.465*	0.001	0.038	0.014	0.221
23	0.150	0.576*	0.133	-0.108	0.103	0.394
24	-0.097	0.111	0.655*	0.144	-0.061	0.475
25	0.749*	-0.079	-0.023	0.261	-0.053	0.639
26	0.013	0.485*	0.135	0.272	-0.332	0.438
27	0.667*	-0.162	-0.108	0.158	0.038	0.510
28	0.225	-0.038	0.466*	-0.368	0.025	0.406
29	0.436*	-0.055	-0.218	0.265	0.245	0.371
30	0.234	0.290	-0.088	-0.131	0.592*	0.515
31	0.460	0.481*	0.021	0.088	-0.269	0.524
32	0.056	-0.080	0.391	0.031	0.489*	0.402
33	-0.263	-0.321	0.035	0.348*	0.306	0.388
34	0.014	0.407*	-0.043	0.041	-0.102	0.180
35	0.560*	0.052	0.488	-0.056	-0.042	0.559
36	0.490*	0.230	0.365	-0.250	-0.037	0.490

* Indicates the primary factor loading for that item

Table 5 (continued)

	Factor Loadings of Items on Factors					Communalities
Item	1	2	3	4	5	
37	0.812*	0.024	-0.003	0.117	0.113	0.686
38	0.129	-0.007	0.163	-0.023	-0.430*	0.229
39	0.673*	0.190	0.357	0.006	0.224	0.667
40	0.147	-0.102	0.106	0.392*	0.200	0.237
41	0.233	0.139	-0.029	0.544*	-0.174	0.401
42	-0.035	0.372	0.402	0.505*	-0.015	0.556
43	0.838*	-0.025	-0.037	0.133	0.026	0.723
44	0.370	0.076	0.587*	0.124	0.375	0.644
45	0.761*	0.164	0.118	0.137	-0.067	0.643
V_p^a	18.20	7.19	7.07	5.93	5.29	43.67

* Indicates the primary factor loading for that item

a The percent of total variance accounted for by each factor

Table 6 identifies the ten items selected from the pilot study instrument for use in the Teacher Attitude Inventory used in this study. Table 6 also reports the primary factor loadings obtained for each of these items and indicates their wording style and scoring sequence.

Evidence presented in this section of the report established factorial validity of the Teacher Attitude Inventory and suggested grounds for accepting its reliability.

CONSTRUCTION OF THE PRESTIGE DIFFERENTIALS AND ATTITUDE INVENTORY (PDAI)

The instruments described under the above heading were the versions used to collect the data required for the main study. Necessary revisions indicated by analysis of the data obtained from the pilot study were made to the appropriate instruments; the Professional-Personal Characteristics Prestige Rating Scale was extended (item 8) and an

Table 6

Item Identification, Primary Factor Loading, Wording Style and Scoring Sequence for Items Included in the Teacher Attitude Inventory (Pilot Version)

Pilot Instrument Item	Primary Factor Loading	Attitude Inventory Item	Wording	Scoring Sequence
The elected officials of my ATA local provide competent leadership	0.694	1	Positive	
The Executive Council of the provincial ATA does not spend the funds of the Association wisely	0.812	2	Negative	Reflected
The programs, activities and services of The Alberta Teachers' Association are improving	0.767	3	Positive	
The Alberta Teachers' Association is not sufficiently concerned with matters of real importance to its members	0.749	4	Negative	Reflected
In general, the employed staff officers of The Alberta Teachers' Association provide very competent service	0.681	5	Positive	
I am not satisfied with the opportunity I have to participate in the policy-making and governmental functions of the provincial ATA	0.667	6	Negative	Reflected
If I had the choice, I would not belong to The Alberta Teachers' Association	0.673	7	Negative	Reflected
Most of the criticism of the provincial association by its members is justified	0.654	8	Negative	Reflected
The Executive Council of the provincial ATA is not providing competent leadership	0.838	9	Negative	Reflected
The programs and policies of The Alberta Teachers' Association generally meet with my approval and support	0.761	10	Positive	

additional instrument, the Attitude/Behaviour Inventory was developed and included as Part D of the PDAI. The procedures followed for checking the validity and reliability of the instruments used and the results obtained from treatment of the relevant data are reported in subsequent sections of this chapter. An explanatory letter describing the purpose of the study and soliciting the cooperation of participating teachers and administrators is positioned to precede the instruments which constitute the four separate parts of the PDAI.

Personal-Educational Information Instrument

The final version of this instrument contains 17 "fixed alternative" type items. With the exception of two additional items (16 and 17) and minor modifications in the wording of three others the item content is identical to that used in the pilot study instrument. There was no evidence to indicate that this instrument was inadequate or inefficient for the purpose of this study.

Positional Prestige Rating Scale (PPRS)

This rating scale was designed for the purpose of collecting data on teacher perceived measures of prestige which these persons attribute to various teacher groupings classified according to specific positional characteristics. A definition of the term prestige that reflects the basic notion of the concept advanced by several writers on the subject is included for easy reference of the respondent. This instrument, and the one displayed in the second section of Part B employ a six-position Likert-type rating scale to obtain the respondent's estimate of the amount of prestige he would accord to each particular teacher subgroup specified. The "low" and "high" extremes of the continuum are designated. A sample item appears below:

	AMOUNT OF PRESTIGE I ATTRIBUTE TO THE GROUP					
	LOW		-	-	HIGH	
Item 8. Teachers - Commercial subjects . .	1	2	3	4	5	6

The distribution of responses obtained from the main sample for each item evaluated indicates that the six scale positions provided an adequate range of measures to discriminate among teacher perceptions of prestige.

Validity and Reliability of the Prestige Rating Instruments

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients computed for the mean prestige scores of each item of the Positional Prestige Rating Scale are reported in Table 7. Data presented in Table 7 reveal a strong relationship among the scores obtained for the sub-groupings of principals (values above .65) and among the corresponding vocational-technical mean scores. Essentially, the data in Table 7 indicate a strong relationship among scores obtained for clusters of related positions and a weak relationship among those scores for positions which, by nature, appear to be different. This provides additional supportive evidence for accepting the validity of the PPRS.

Examination of the correlation coefficients (these are too numerous to present here in suitable tabular form) computed for the items of each professional and personal characteristic indicate that except for sex categories a rather close relationship (values in the range of 0.703 to 0.903) exists between mean item scores on adjacent items belonging to each particular characteristic. e.g. Age: (25-35 and 36-50, r= .715) The reverse situation prevails for mean item scores of items

Table 7

Pearson "r" Correlation Coefficients for Items Included in the Positional Prestige Rating Scale* (PPRS)

Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1	--																		
2	.31																		
3	.27	.76																	
4	.33	.40	.43																
5	.41	.36	.19	.18															
6	.45	.30	.28	.31	.56														
7	.24	.72	.76	.41	.26	.30													
8	.53	.37	.30	.37	.44	.51	.30												
9	.13	.51	.68	.31	.05	.16	.72	.17											
10	.59	.40	.30	.37	.54	.54	.31	.73	.18										
11	.41	.32	.29	.34	.54	.47	.31	.46	.22	.56									
12	.13	.58	.67	.34	.10	.22	.78	.21	.77	.22	.29								
13	.55	.38	.29	.36	.54	.57	.31	.68	.14	.75	.51	.16							
14	.09	.43	.65	.31	-.07	.12	.56	.17	.81	.14	.14	.66	.09						
15	.44	.34	.28	.32	.55	.53	.34	.51	.19	.54	.52	.25	.58	.19					
16	.58	.37	.28	.31	.54	.55	.30	.69	.18	.77	.53	.20	.71	.12	.61				
17	.26	.35	.43	.43	.07	.29	.42	.28	.43	.27	.22	.41	.28	.39	.27	.29			
18	.35	.29	.33	.27	.38	.47	.35	.47	.32	.45	.43	.32	.47	.30	.40	.48	.44		
19	.23	.28	.38	.48	-.04	.20	.36	.22	.37	.21	.18	.37	.20	.35	.18	.12	.61	.29	--

*Since no attempt was made to account for missing data N's vary for several of the items. Range = 693 to 706.

belonging to different characteristics (values below 0.500) with few exceptions. e.g. (Teachers, 25-30 years of age and Teachers with over 20 years teaching experience, r = .195) Coefficients with values in the range of 0.601 to 0.687 were produced for mean scores obtained from the youngest (under 25) and least experienced (less than 3 years) subgroups and from the oldest (over 60) and more experienced (over 20 years) subgroups. Comparisons of mean item scores for items belonging to the various characteristics, and mean item scores indicating the relative importance of personal and professional characteristics yielded very low values (in the range 0.240 to 0.284) indicating negative or remote relationships.

Table 8 reports the correlation coefficients obtained for comparisons involving the mean prestige scores derived from the total sample perceptions on the relative importance of the seven professional and personal characteristics considered. (Item 8, Part B, Section 2, of the PDAI) Values of the coefficients reported reveal remote relationships among the mean scores for all characteristics except sex and teaching level (0.511) and sex and ATA office held (0.508).

Distributions of scores provided by the total sample and the range of mean prestige scores are reported later (see Chapter IV) for each item of the Positional Characteristics Prestige Rating Scale and the Professional-Personal Characteristics Prestige Rating Scale. These data provide further evidence of the scales' discriminatory power. On the basis of the relationships described above and other observations reported here, the Prestige Rating instruments appear to have acceptable validity. However, since they were specially developed for this study it is impossible to establish their reliability coefficients with a high

Table 8

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients Based on Mean Prestige Scores Indicating Relative Importance of Professional and Personal Characteristics*

Characteristic	Teaching Exp.	Teaching Qual.	Place of Prof. Prep.	Age	Teaching Level	Sex	ATA Office Held
$\overline{X}$ =	(4.454)	(4.277)	(3.701)	(3.455)	(3.327)	(2.519)	(2.412)
Teaching Experience	--	0.331	0.355	0.394	0.335	0.243	0.194
Teaching Qualifications			0.430	0.325	0.271	0.260	0.253
Place of Prof. Prep.				0.423	0.471	0.319	0.243
Age					0.369	0.392	0.248
Teaching Level						0.511	0.375
Sex							0.508
ATA Office Held							--

*Since no attempt was made to account for missing data N's vary for each characteristic. Range = 694 to 705.

degree of confidence. Testing their performance in similar situations is required.

Teacher Attitude Inventory

This instrument, designated as Part C of the PDAI, was developed specially for this study. It consists of ten statements worded to express either a positive or negative orientation toward basic policies and practices of The Alberta Teachers' Association. A five-point Likert-type rating scale is used to obtain the degree of agreement or disagreement of the respondent on each inventory item. In scoring, a value of five was awarded to the least favourable alternative and a value of one to the most favourable. This procedure was reversed for the five items which were structured to be antithetical to ATA policy and practice.

The universe of interest selected for this instrument was confined to measures of attitude which would provide an estimate of the respondent's degree of support for the professional organization. Consequently, item content was selected which would indicate the effectiveness of the professional organization in meeting member expectations. Procedures employed to select items and establish validity checks have been explained in a previous section of this chapter. Results of Factor Analysis treatment of main study data for the Teacher Attitude Inventory are reported in Chapter IV.

The Attitude/Behaviour Inventory

This inventory is a revised version of the Professional Inventory developed by Hall (1969:81-91) to measure the degree of professionalism among practitioners on each of five attitudes of professionalism: use of the professional organization as a major referent, belief in public service, belief in self-regulation, sense of calling to the field, and a feeling of autonomy. He used ten items for each of the five dimensions of professionalism listed. An empirical reassessment of this scale reported by Snizek (1972:109-114) provided the basis for the revisions undertaken by the investigator.

Construction of the Revised Version. Permission was obtained from Professor Hall to use a selected number of items from his original inventory. Research evidence presented by Snizek (1972:111-112) was influential in the decision taken to develop an instrument consisting of 20 of the most scalable items for measuring teachers' attitudes toward four rather than five dimensions of professionalism. Due to the relatively high inter-dimensional correlation coefficient values reported by Snizek (1972:112) for his and Hall's sets of data concerned with the sense of calling concept, and the relatively low stratified reliability coefficients he obtained for the same data, this dimension was deleted.

The basis used for item selection was the results obtained from factor analyses carried out by Snizek (1972:111) on the Hall and Snizek sets of data. From the total of ten inventory items used for each of the four dimensions of professionalism involved, five securing the highest related factor loadings on both investigations were selected. The Snizek analysis also demonstrated that the reliability of the Hall scale did not diminish appreciably by deletion of five items from each component of the scale. Reliability coefficients computed through the use of the Kuder-Richardson Formula 20 indicated the decrease for all dimensions to be minimal: Hall's data reveal a drop from .86 to .84; Snizek's data from .80 to .78.

The Likert scaling and scoring procedures used by Hall were retained for the Attitude/Behaviour Instrument. Most favourable responses were awarded a weighting of one and most unfavourable responses a weighting of five.

The Dimensions of Professionalism. Four dimensions of professionalism consisting of five items each comprise the Attitude/Behaviour Scale. (See Appendix A) A brief description of the concept [based on Hall's views (1969:81-82)] associated with each dimension according to the title used to describe it is provided:

Dimension 2 (Profession) uses the professional organization as a major referent. The related items seek to determine how strongly influenced the practitioner is by the standards of his profession.

Dimension 3 (Belief in Public Service) is concerned with the degree to which the practitioner has developed a belief in public service, or a commitment to service for his fellow man as well as maintenance and expansion of the body of knowledge which is his expertise.

Dimension 4 (Belief in Self-Regulation) attempts to measure the strength of the practitioner's belief in self-regulation, the concept representing endorsement of the notion of colleague control or authority over his work.

Dimension 5 (Autonomy) investigates the practitioner's attitude toward autonomy which is interpreted to mean his desire to be free from external threat or pressure to make decisions about his own work.

SUMMARY

Data required for testing the hypotheses advanced for the study were collected by means of a specially prepared questionnaire designed to elicit teacher reactions to a number of prestige and professionalism matters. This inventory includes a personal-educational data section, two sections including instruments designed to measure teachers' prestige perceptions about selected positional, professional and personal characteristics, and two sections including attitude scales for measuring selected concepts of professionalism. Results of the analysis of data obtained from a pilot study provided the basis for most of the revisions and additions to the instruments used in the study. These data also provided means for establishing instrument validity and reliability checks and for the selection of items to be used in the Teacher Attitude Inventory.

CHAPTER IV

SOURCES, COLLECTION, AND TREATMENT OF THE DATA

This chapter contains an explanation of the procedures used in obtaining and examining the data for this study. The nature of the sample, methods used in selection of the sample and in the collection and statistical treatment of the data obtained are discussed. This section of the report also includes a tabulation of the frequency distributions for characteristics of the total teacher sample selected to describe it.

SOURCES AND COLLECTION OF THE DATA

Securing the required data for this study necessitated contact with a large number of teachers and administrators located throughout the province. In order to facilitate this task, permission of the Executive Council of The Alberta Teachers' Association was obtained to request the cooperation of the teachers involved, to use the association membership lists, and to distribute the questionnaire through the Association's mailing facility.

The Sample

To obtain a sample representative of the Alberta teaching force a systematized random sampling technique was employed to select 1094 names (approximately five percent of the total membership) from the most current membership lists of The Alberta Teachers' Association. The same procedure was followed to generate an additional 100 names on a supplementary list which provided the source for replacing questionnaires returned as undeliverable or incomplete. On the basis of selecting a random sample of similar size (approximately 1000) to those employed by Ingram (1965) and Hyrnyk (1966) in recent successful studies involving the same population, it was assumed that representativeness would be achieved. A comparison of the study sample and the Alberta teacher force is presented in Table 9. A noticeable discrepancy exists between the two sets of data which report on less than three years of teaching experience. If the Alberta teaching force statistic is correct then the less than three years of teaching experience group was under represented in this study.

The Prestige Differentials and Attitudes Questionnaire

The Prestige Differentials and Attitudes questionnaire was mailed to each of the 1094 teachers comprising the study sample on November 17, 1972. Approximately ten days later follow-up reminder cards were sent to the same teachers. A final appeal in personal letter form went to each prospective respondent on December 7, 1972 urging the early return of completed questionnaires. Notices included in December issues of newsletters published by the four largest ATA city locals requested teachers in these locations who had received questionnaires to complete and return them promptly.

Ninety questionnaires were returned as undeliverable. Twenty-one of these returns were readdressed and forwarded. To compensate for the remainder, 69 substitutes selected from the supplementary list received questionnaires. Twenty-five personal letters, late arrivals and unusable questionnaires reduced the total number of possible respondents to 1069. Seven hundred and twelve usable questionnaires representing a return of 66.6 percent were received in time to be included in the analysis.

Table 9

Comparison of Study Sample to Alberta Teacher Force* by Percentages

Characteristic	Category	Total Sample (1972-73)	Alberta Teaching Force[a] (1971-72)
Sex	Male	44.9	43.4
	Female	55.1	56.6
Experience	Less than 3 Yr.	8.4	23.1
	3 Yr.	8.0	6.8
	4 - 5 Yr.	13.5	11.2
	6 - 10 Yr.	23.8	20.9
	More than 10 Yr.	46.3	37.8
Place of Professional Preparation	Alberta	70.0	72.1
	Other Can. Prov.	20.3	19.4
	Other Country	9.7	8.5
Teaching Level	Elementary	46.3	50.2
	Secondary	47.7	42.1
Teacher Education	1 Yr.	9.2	9.3
	2 Yr.	8.9	13.0
	3 Yr.	11.3	12.8
	4 Yr.	41.5	42.7
	5 Yr.	17.4	13.8
	6 Yr. or more	11.7	8.2
	Degree Holders	69.9	63.6

* The Alberta Teachers' Association, The Alberta Teaching Force, September, 1971. Unpublished Document, Edmonton: The Alberta Teachers' Association, August, 1972.

[a] These were the only characteristics on which comparable statistics could be secured.

TREATMENT OF DATA

Description of the treatment of the data is reported in a section describing the scoring procedures used and the results obtained. A subsequent section outlines the statistical treatments applied to the data.

Scoring

The information provided by respondents on the PDAI's was transferred to computer cards. Items in the attitude scales included in Sections C and D of the inventory that were not answered were assigned a value of three for a maximum of two missing responses in Section C and each of the four dimensions comprising the Attitude/Behaviour Scale in Section D. Three or more missing responses on Part C or any one dimension of Part D resulted in these scales receiving a zero score so that data cards could be identified and removed from the sample under consideration when the analysis required such treatment. No attempt was made to compensate for missing data in the other parts of the questionnaire. Data cards which did not include responses for the particular items included in the various analyses were removed prior to statistical treatment of the data.

Prestige measures for each of the separate scale items were obtained by computing the sum of all the weighted responses made by members of a particular teacher group and dividing this sum by the number of teacher respondents in that group. The resulting mean scores served as the basis for determining the relative prestige rank of teacher subgroups and characteristics evaluated.

Indices of professionalism for "high" and "low" prestige teacher groups were obtained in much the same manner for each of the five dimensions of professionalism examined. Weighted scale responses were summed and divided by the appropriate frequency to calculate mean attitude scores for the various groups on each dimension of professionalism. To carry out comparisons between and among mean attitude score differences, raw scores for the groups involved were standardized to produce equivalent measures for responses from the two separate attitude inventories used. All mean attitude scale scores of the groups involved were standardized to a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of ten.

Results of Scoring

The frequency of interval scale responses obtained from the total teacher sample on each category of the positional, professional and personal characteristics evaluated is reported in Tables 10, 11 and 12. The range for each set of scores is also reported in these tables but mean scores and standard deviations are not as they are reported elsewhere in the study. These data are not reported for the selected subgroups involved since there were more than 30 of them. Table 13 reports the frequency of interval scale responses obtained from the total teacher sample on the rating scale used to evaluate the relative importance of professional and personal characteristics.

Results of Factor Analysis Treatment of Main Study Data

The Teacher Attitude Inventory. The data obtained from the sample on both attitude instruments used in the main study were subjected to a Factor Analysis treatment, primarily for the purpose of determining the degree of "empirical fit" of the ten items comprising the Teacher

Table 10

Frequency of Response by Rating Scale Interval and Range of Mean Prestige Scores for Total Teacher Sample According to Positional Characteristic Evaluated

Teacher Group Evaluated	Frequency Obtained on Rating Scale Interval (Low) 1	2	3	4	5	(High) 6	Total
T. - Phys. Ed.	26	62	199	248	104	63	702
Prin. - Elem.	17	24	74	210	240	138	704
Prin. - Jr. High	13	11	57	196	283	143	703
Couns.-Psych.	50	80	135	213	143	79	700
T. Elem. (1-6)	17	40	134	216	150	149	706
T. - Fine Arts	9	36	165	254	152	83	699
Prin.-Elem.-Jr. Hi.	11	16	54	209	281	131	702
T. - Commercial	12	55	202	256	108	68	701
Prin.-Jr.-Sr. Hi.	11	14	46	144	271	214	700
T. - Ind. Arts	15	56	184	270	116	60	701
T. - Special Ed.	10	27	111	228	200	125	701
Prin.-Elem.-Sr. Hi.	11	19	47	180	247	197	701
T. - Home Ec.	9	59	184	271	117	62	702
Prin. - Sr. Hi.	13	12	34	112	247	283	701
Librarians	14	54	146	254	144	87	699
T. - Vocational	10	54	183	272	111	70	700
Dept. Heads-Curr.	17	40	100	275	205	65	702
T. - Sec. Academic	3	9	88	314	205	79	698
Supervisors-Coord.	25	64	113	197	219	86	704

Range of Mean Prestige Scores = 3.76 - 5.02

Table 11

Frequency of Response by Rating Scale Interval and Range of Mean Prestige Scores for Total Teacher Sample According to Professional Characteristic Evaluated

Teacher Group Evaluated	Frequency Obtained on Rating Scale Interval (Low) 1	2	3	4	5	(High) 6	Total
Experience							
Teachers:							
Less than 3 Yr.	41	169	249	158	56	33	704
3 - 5 Yr.	5	32	181	297	126	65	706
6 - 10 Yr.	3	4	58	276	241	124	706
11 - 15 Yr.	3	3	46	228	276	149	706
16 - 20 Yr.	5	13	71	214	227	176	706
Over 20 Yr.	19	32	106	192	1[illegible]0	177	706
Range of Mean Prestige Scores = 3.17 - 4.73							
Teaching Level							
Teachers:							
Div. I (1 - 3)	12	32	99	171	172	220	706
Div. II (4 - 6)	5	17	109	238	196	141	706
Jr. High (7 - 9)	4	12	67	265	219	139	706
Sr. High (10 - 12)	4	10	58	201	244	189	706
Range of Mean Prestige Scores = 4.45 - 4.75							
University Qualifications							
Teachers:							
Less than 3 Yr.	69	157	215	158	67	39	705
Prof. Cert.	9	37	157	284	154	63	704
B. Ed.	5	11	54	301	219	114	704
Two Bach. Degs.	5	10	39	241	268	142	705
M. Ed.	6	11	37	155	282	213	704
D.Ed. or Ph.D.	11	24	45	132	198	295	705
Range of Mean Prestige Scores = 3.16 - 4.94							
ATA Office Held							
Teachers:							
No Office	38	61	189	263	85	64	700
Pres. of Local	22	23	88	271	219	76	699
Ch. PD Comm.	21	27	95	302	183	71	699
Ch. SN Comm.	19	23	76	245	225	111	699
Mem. of PEC	24	30	79	234	241	91	699
Pres. Prov. Assn.	30	25	66	193	210	175	699
Range of Mean Prestige Scores = 3.70 - 4.51							

Table 12

Frequency of Response by Rating Scale Interval and Range of Mean Prestige Scores for Total Teacher Sample According to Personal Characteristic Evaluated

Teacher Subgroup Evaluated	Frequency Obtained on Rating Scale Interval (Low) 1	2	3	4	5	(High) 6	Total
Age							
Teachers:							
Under 25 Years	26	79	214	221	107	60	707
25 - 35 Years	3	12	79	243	231	139	707
36 - 50 Years	3	4	83	237	250	129	706
51 - 60 Years	11	60	149	264	146	76	706
Over 60 Years	83	121	191	185	75	49	704
	Range of Mean Prestige Scores = 3.28 - 4.58						
Sex of Teacher							
Teachers:							
Male	8	13	48	258	215	163	705
Female	8	15	87	275	177	143	705
	Range of Mean Prestige Scores = 4.46 - 4.63						
Place of Prof. Prep.							
Teachers:							
Alberta	10	13	62	211	230	176	702
Other Can. Prov.	6	13	99	292	198	91	699
United States	34	83	204	238	85	51	695
England	20	67	170	226	143	69	695
India	103	157	226	146	34	28	694
West Indies	94	159	227	148	31	32	691
Other Countries	66	121	252	186	34	32	691
	Range of Mean Prestige Scores = 2.94 - 4.66						

Table 13

Frequency of Response by Rating Scale Interval and Range of Mean Prestige Scores According to Relative Importance of Professional and Personal Characteristics as Perceived by Total Teacher Sample

Characteristic Considered	Frequency Obtained on Rating Scale Interval (Low) 1	2	3	4	5	(High) 6	Total
Age	96	86	139	218	112	52	703
Teaching Qualifications	40	33	75	208	235	110	701
Place of Professional Preparation	72	70	132	211	148	67	700
Teaching Level	141	77	120	189	128	48	703
Sex of Teacher	271	105	105	157	43	22	703
ATA Office Held	270	124	126	131	40	13	704
Teaching Experience	35	22	75	176	250	147	705

Range of Mean Prestige Scores = 2.41 - 4.45

Attitude Inventory. The results of this analysis are reported in Table 14 and indicate that each of the ten items of the Teacher Attitude Inventory obtained primary factor loadings and located under the appropriate identification factor.

Factor Analysis of Attitude/Behaviour Scale Data. Table 15 reports the nature of the factor loadings obtained from the factor analysis carried out on the Attitude/Behaviour Scale data secured for this study. The perfect component "fit" achieved by all 20 inventory

Table 14

Principal-Axis With a Varimax Rotation Factor Solution for the Teacher Attitude and Attitude/Behaviour Inventories (Five-Factor Field)

	Factor	Loadings of	Items on	Factors		Commu-nal-ities
Item	1	2	3	4	5	
1	0.635*	-0.074	-0.071	0.025	0.015	0.414
2	-0.634*	-0.001	-0.026	0.068	0.111	0.420
3	0.681*	0.010	-0.044	0.034	-0.047	0.470
4	-0.751*	0.027	0.010	0.066	-0.015	0.570
5	0.761*	-0.027	-0.072	0.052	-0.005	0.588
6	-0.570*	0.086	0.024	0.131	-0.026	0.351
7	0.682*	0.048	-0.145	0.018	-0.067	0.494
8	-0.695*	-0.031	0.036	0.053	0.102	0.499
9	-0.821*	-0.006	0.016	0.084	-0.013	0.681
10	0.815*	-0.011	-0.039	0.024	-0.022	0.667
11	0.095	-0.033	-0.010	0.042	-0.831	0.702
12	-0.050	0.017	0.715	0.059	0.017	0.517
13	0.024	-0.700	-0.041	-0.111	0.107	0.516
14	0.008	-0.056	-0.076	-0.702	-0.113	0.514
15	0.215	0.060	-0.158	-0.020	-0.506	0.331
16	0.091	0.022	-0.733	-0.024	-0.044	0.548
17	-0.089	0.584	0.060	0.024	0.071	0.359
18	-0.175	0.262	0.089	0.522	-0.004	0.380
19	0.516	0.053	-0.229	0.018	-0.126	0.338
20	-0.066	0.136	0.617	0.050	-0.006	0.406
21	0.080	0.711	0.107	-0.018	0.048	0.527
22	0.021	-0.004	-0.026	0.323	-0.098	0.115
23	-0.706	0.126	0.140	-0.060	0.147	0.559
24	-0.108	0.063	0.704	0.027	0.197	0.551
25	-0.033	0.654	0.101	-0.003	0.153	0.463
26	0.030	-0.061	-0.048	-0.730	-0.016	0.540
27	0.001	0.134	-0.054	0.018	0.819	0.693
28	0.074	-0.092	-0.435	0.011	0.072	0.209
29	0.010	-0.758	0.008	-0.063	0.068	0.583
30	0.015	-0.083	0.000	0.679	0.042	0.470
V_p^a	19.75	8.38	7.65	6.45	6.01	48.25

* Indicates the primary factor loading for that item

a The percent of total variance accounted for by each factor
Items 1 to 10 - Teacher Attitude Inventory (Dim. 1)
Items 11 to 30 - Attitude/Behaviour Inventory (Dims. 2, 3, 4, 5)

Table 15

Results Obtained from Factor Analysis of Study Data Produced by the Attitude/Behaviour Scale According to Varimax Rotations from Principal Axes Solutions for Four Factors

Item No.	Factor**				Dimension		
	1	2	3	4	Theoretical	Empirical	Scoring
1			0.806*		Profession	2	
2		0.702*			B. Pub. Ser.	3	R
3	0.694*				B. Self-Reg.	4	
4				0.735*	Autonomy	5	
5			0.575*		Profession	2	
6		0.702*			B. Pub. Ser.	3	
7	0.594*				B. Self-Reg.	4	R
8				0.511*	Autonomy	5	R
9			0.367*		Profession	2	
10		-0.608*			B. Pub. Ser.	3	
11	0.731*				B. Self-Reg.	4	R
12				0.309*	Autonomy	5	R
13			0.428*		Profession	2	R
14		0.693*			B. Pub. Ser.	3	R
15	0.673*				B. Self-Reg.	4	R
16				0.751*	Autonomy	5	
17			0.746*		Profession	2	R
18		0.451*			B. Pub. Ser.	3	
19	0.768*				B. Self-Reg.	4	
20				0.660*	Autonomy	5	R

* Indicates the primary factor loading for that item

** Factor 3 identifies Dimension 2 (Profession as major referent)
Factor 2 identifies Dimension 3 (Belief in public service)
Factor 1 identifies Dimension 4 (Belief in self-regulation)
Factor 4 identifies Dimension 5 (Autonomy)

items is noteworthy. The negative factor loading of -0.608 obtained for item ten is also significant since Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients computed for the four related items produced negative values as follows: 10 and 2 = -0.369, 10 and 6 = -0.311, 10 and 14 = -0.305, and 10 and 18 = -0.144. This finding indicates that the scoring sequence for item ten on the Hall inventory should be reversed unless a printing error has been made in the scoring directions provided.

Table 16 presents the results of analyses reported by Snizek (1972:111) on the Hall and Snizek data and for the related data obtained in this study. Rotated factor matrices were employed to determine the degree of empirical "fit" of the items used to measure each of the four theoretical dimensions of professionalism.

The data reveal that the items selected from the Hall inventory have in the case of this study an acceptable factor loading on the appropriate dimension of professionalism with but one possible exception. The factor loading of .31 obtained for item 40 of the Hall inventory (item 12 of the revised inventory used in this study) may be considered somewhat low. This factor loading was the highest of all obtained for this item and as indicated in Table 16 it did locate with the cluster identifying the autonomy component of professionalism.

Analysis of corresponding data for this study indicates that the factor loadings obtained for each item included in the first, second and third dimensions are consistently higher in every case than those reported for the Snizek data and with but one exception, item 40, they are similar to those he reported for the fourth dimension.

When the factor loadings reported for data in this study are compared to those reported for corresponding items in the Hall study

Table 16

Orthogonal Varimax Rotations from Principal Axes Solutions for Four Factors: Hall vs. Snizek vs. Study Sample Data

		Empirical Dimensions											
		Hall Data **				Snizek Data **				Sample Study Data			
Theor. Dim.	Hall Item	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
I. Prof. as Ref.	1	.56*				-.42*				.81*			
	6	.58*				-.24				.58*			
	16	.55*				-.16				.38*			
	26	.52*				-.44*				.43*			
	36	.54*				-.31				.75*			
II. B. in Public Ser.	2		.68*				-.66*				.70*		
	7		.55*				-.50*				.70*		
	12		.47*				-.53*				-.61*		
	17		.70*				-.64*				.69*		
	47		.63*				-.31*				.45*		
III. B. in Self-Reg.	8			-.57*				.31				.69*	
	18			-.45*				.56*				.59*	
	33			-.68*				.64*				.73*	
	43			-.67*				.59*				.67*	
	18			-.60*				.47*				.77*	
IV. Autonomy	5				.71*				-.69*				.74*
	15				.64*				-.61*				.51*
	40				.55*				-.57*				.31*
	45				.71*				-.73*				.75*
	50				.66*				-.70*				.66*

* Indicates the primary factor loading for that item

** Reported by Snizek (1972:111)

it is apparent that an almost identical situation prevails. The analysis of data obtained from this study produced factor loadings equal to or greater than those reported for the Hall study in all but six of the 20 cases. In two of these the difference is slight, but in the case of items 16, 26, 40 and 47 the difference is more pronounced.

In summary, Table 16 presents strong evidence to establish the validity and reliability of the Attitude/Behaviour Scale. Each of the 20 items selected from the Hall scale demonstrate a perfect "fit" with their theoretically established components of professionalism according to the analyses of data from Hall's and this study. Snizek's analysis fails to offer the same evidence with regard to the data from his study for items 6, 8, 16 and 36.

It would appear that the recommendation made by Snizek (1972:112) regarding use of the Hall scale in the immediate future was well founded since modifications to the scale adopted for this study were based in large part on his suggestion to delete certain of the original items in order to diminish the scale item empirical overlap discovered.

Relationships Among Dimensions of Attitude Scales

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients for the unadjusted means of summed scores obtained for each dimension of both attitude scales is reported in Table 17. These statistics indicate a weak positive relationship exists between the means of the Teacher Attitude Scale (Organization dimension) and the second dimension (Profession) of the Attitude/Behaviour Inventory. There is an absence of high positive relationships among the mean scores reported for other dimensions. Reasonably strong positive relationships exist between the mean scores for each dimension of the Attitude/Behaviour Inventory and the mean

Table 17

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients for Means of Summed Scores Based on Data Provided by Teacher Attitude and Behaviour/Attitude Measurement Scales

Dimension of Professionalism	1*	2	3	4	5	6**
1 (Organization)	---	0.489	0.191	0.056	0.091	0.348
2 (Profession)			0.225	0.123	0.037	0.589
3 (Public Service)				0.158	0.102	0.650
4 (Self-Regulation)					0.143	0.633
5 (Autonomy)						0.482
6**						---

* Indicates the Teacher Attitude Scale (Dimension 1: Organization)

** Indicates the coefficient value based on the sum of means computed for Dimensions 2, 3, 4 and 5.

score derived from summing of these means.

Substantial evidence has been presented to establish the validity and reliability of the Attitude/Behaviour Inventory developed for this study.

Table 18 shows the mean attitude scores and standard deviations obtained from the total teacher sample on each of the five dimensions of professionalism considered.

TREATMENT PROCEDURES

Two of the measures most widely encountered in describing the "size" of a set of scores and their "spread", the mean and standard deviation were used extensively throughout this study. Initial identification of the various prestige hierarchies were accomplished by ranking

Table 18

Mean Attitude Score and Standard Deviation Obtained
for Total Teacher Sample According to Dimension
of Professionalism Evaluated*

	Dimension of Professionalism Evaluated					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	2,3,4,5
N =	702	708	708	708	708	708
Mean Attitude Score	27.63	13.23	11.79	13.19	12.55	50.75
Standard Deviation	7.74	3.66	3.89	4.02	3.10	8.73

* Dim. 1 - ATA as referent (PDAI - Part C)
Dim. 2 - Profession as referent (PDAI - Part D)
Dim. 3 - Belief in public service (PDAI - Part D)
Dim. 4 - Belief in self-regulation (PDAI - Part D)
Dim. 5 - Autonomy (PDAI - Part D)

mean prestige score values to establish the relative importance of variables associated with each characteristic evaluated. Dispersion of individual prestige estimates from the mean for each set of scores was determined by computing the respective standard deviation (SD).

The hypotheses proposed for this study were mainly concerned with determining relationships among average prestige and attitude estimates secured from various teacher groupings on each of the sets of variables examined. The investigator's major interest focused on rank ordering these sets of associated measures in a manner which would show accurately the relative status of each category evaluated according to the rating group involved. Establishing the presence of and locating differences which were significant at a probability level set (a priori) at .05 required that appropriate data be subjected to suitable statistical treatments. Pre-determined comparisons within, between and across groups could then be made and the results reported with a greater degree of confidence.

In the analysis of data, parametric statistical procedures have been used only when interval variables were being examined. These parametric statistical procedures included the commonly known one-way analysis of variance using repeated measures on one factor, two-way analysis of variance using repeated measures on one factor, product-moment correlation and tests associated with each such as the F-test, t-test and the Newman-Keuls multiple comparison procedure. In the one instance where ordinal variables entered into the analysis the Spearman rank-order correlation, a non-parametric statistical procedure, was followed.

Since this study relied almost exlusively on the use of parametric statistical procedures, assumptions underlying these techniques and the extent to which they were met for this study are discussed. Several sources, such as Ferguson (1966:294) and Winer (1962), indicate that there are five basic requirements underlying parametric statistical procedures: the samples are randomly drawn from a population in which the variables under study are normally distributed, the variances are homogeneous, the contributions of the factors to total variance are additive and there is linearity of regression among variables. This study has assumed that the first requirement, that of random sampling, has been met. Normality of distribution of the variables in the population has been assumed since there was no case in which the data indicated otherwise. The requirement, that of homogeneity of variance, was not formally tested. It was assumed to be met on the basis of discovering by observation that the standard deviations of the arrays tended consistently to be nearly equal. Also, Winer (1962:93) has noted that the F-test is appropriate since it is robust with respect to departures from homogeneity of variance. This statistical technique was employed to test for the presence of most of the relationships hypothesized in this study. Since formal analysis of variance procedures were used for the analysis of data the requirements of linearity of regression among variables was given appropriate consideration.

With respect to the analysis of variance Ferguson (1966:295) has noted,

> With most sets of real data the assumptions underlying analysis of variance are, at best, only roughly satisfied. The raw data of experiments frequently do not exhibit the characteristics which the mathematical models require. One advantage of the analysis of variance is that reasonable departures from the assumptions of normality and homogeneity may occur without seriously affecting the inferences drawn from the data.

As mentioned previously, and for the reasons stated, it was decided to use analysis of variance methods and the F-test to determine the nature and significance of differences among sets of mean scores. To specifically locate and describe implied differences where the over-all F proved to be significant at or beyond the .05 level, the Newman-Keuls multiple comparison procedure, recommended by Glass and Stanley (1970:382) and described by Winer (1962:80-104), was used. According to Winer (1962:82) some other methods produce more significant results than the Newman-Keuls method. Consequently, the probability is increased that results obtained from the use of the Newman-Keuls method are statistically significant.

The minimum criterion level of .05 was selected for all tests employed in the analysis of data.

SUMMARY

The purpose of this chapter has been to describe the nature of the study sample and to explain the procedures which were used to collect and examine the data. On the basis of the information presented representativeness of the sample appears to be satisfactory. Appropriateness of the major statistical procedures used, the assumptions underlying these parametric tests and measures taken to satisfy these assumptions have been discussed in detail. Hopefully, this approach has established a sound procedural basis for the analysis of data carried out to test the hypotheses stated in Chapters V, VI and VII, the three succeeding chapters devoted to reporting and interpreting the results of this investigation.

CHAPTER V

THE NATURE OF POSITIONAL PRESTIGE HIERARCHIES IN TEACHING

This chapter reports the findings related to sub-problems 1(a) and 1(b) of the study. The hypotheses formulated for investigating these two sub-problems predicted that differences in the amounts of prestige attributed to the positional characteristics evaluated by teachers in general, and by specified major sub-groupings of the study sample are significant. The results are presented separately for the total teacher sample and the major teacher sub-groupings involved. Discussion of these results follows in the section preceding the summary.

DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURES

The procedures followed in the analysis of data relevant to this section of the report are outlined here. The sums of respondents' weighted scores for each Positional Prestige Scale item were computed for the total sample and each special positional teacher grouping which was established. Mean scale item scores reporting measures of perceived prestige were derived for the total teacher sample and for each of the positional teacher groupings involved in evaluating the prestige of subgroups listed on the rating scale. Ranking mean scale item scores in order of magnitude provided the basis for constructing initially the various hierarchies. In order to test for the presence of significant differences among the means used for establishing the hierarchies described, and to locate and determine their statistical significance three statistical techniques were used. The one-way analysis of variance was used to test for the presence of differences among means which were statistically significant at the .05 level or beyond. Statistical evidence regarding the level of significance of differences and their precise location was obtained first by application of the correlated t-test technique and secondly by subjecting appropriate data to the somewhat more rigourous Newman-Keuls multiple comparison procedure recommended by Winer (1962:80). Correlation coefficients showing relationships among the rank-ordered mean prestige scores provided by each of the five major teacher groups on the 19 teaching positions evaluated were computed by using the Spearman rank-order correlation method. These statistical techniques are explained in Chapter IV.

FINDINGS: PRESTIGE DIFFERENTIALS BASED ON TOTAL SAMPLE PERCEPTIONS

Results of the analysis of data primarily concerned with ranking appropriate mean prestige measures are presented prior to relating the results of analyses concerned with the statistical significance of differences between and among these measures. The hypothesis which provided the basis for the analyses carried out is stated below:

Hypothesis 1.1: There are significant differences in the amounts of prestige which teachers in general attribute to subgroups classified according to the specified positional characteristics.

Table 19 presents a summary of the analysis of data obtained to determine the presence and nature of the positional prestige hierarchy based on the perceptions of a representative sample of Alberta teachers. Examination of the results reported in Table 19 indicates that teachers do perceive prestige differentials among the various "positions held in

Table 19

Mean Prestige Scores, Standard Deviations and Prestige Ranks Based on Total Sample Response to Positional Prestige Rating Scale Items

Teacher Group Evaluated	PPRS Item	N	Mean Prestige Score	S.D.	Prestige Rank
Principals - Sr. High	14	701	5.020	1.10	1
Principals - Jr.-Sr. High	9	700	4.850	1.09	2
Principals - Elem.-Sr. High	12	700	4.750	1.11	3
Principals - Jr. High	3	703	4.640	1.06	4
Principals - Elem.-Jr. High	7	702	4.600	1.04	5
Principals - Elem.	2	706	4.490	1.16	6
Teachers - Special Ed.	11	701	4.364	1.14	7
Teachers - Sec. Academic	18	698	4.355	0.91	8
Teachers - Grades 1-6	5	706	4.260	1.27	9
Dept. Heads-Curric. Assoc.	17	702	4.150	1.11	10
Supervisors-Coordinators	19	704	4.110	1.28	11
Teachers - Fine Arts	6	699	4.080	1.12	12
Librarians	15	699	4.030	1.18	13
Teachers - Vocational	16	700	3.900	1.12	14
Teachers - Home Ec.	13	702	3.880	1.10	15
Teachers - Commercial	8	701	3.852	1.13	16
Teachers - Ind. Arts	10	701	3.850	1.12	17
Counsellors-Psychologists	4	700	3.790	1.38	18
Teachers - Phys. Ed.	1	702	3.760	1.19	19

school." Even though some of the mean scale scores do not appear to differ appreciably, the existence of a positional prestige hierarchy is apparent. As may be expected principals are given the highest statuses in the hierarchy. Teachers attribute varying amounts of prestige to these positions on the basis of the grade levels included in each administrative unit. Senior High School principals enjoy the most prestigious position in this hierarchy. The importance of the other five administrator subgroups decreases in direct relation to the student level administered. Consequently, Elementary School principals achieved the sixth or lowest rank position of all principal categories. Other leadership positions such as Department Heads, Supervisors and Coordinators, are accorded much less prestige by teachers so they place in lower ranks. Teachers of Special Education, Secondary Academic subjects and elementary school grades are perceived by teachers in general as having more prestige and consequently higher statuses than teachers serving in leadership-supervisory capacities. It is noteworthy that Special Education teachers achieved a rank next to principals, and Elementary School teachers share approximately the same prestige as Secondary Academic teachers in the opinion of the total teacher sample. The lower end of the positional prestige hierarchy is occupied by teacher subgroups which seem to constitute two rather separate strata. Fine Arts teachers, Librarians, Technical, Vocational and Commercial teachers constitute the first stratum while Counsellors, Psychologists and Physical Education teachers share the stratum which includes the lowest statuses of all. The standard deviations indicate that a high proportion of the total sample scores reported for each of the 19 positional subgroups evaluated, cluster within the limits of about one scale interval above or below the mean.

The procedure used in Table 19 of rank-ordering mean prestige scores to establish the positional prestige hierarchy in teaching may have some shortcomings in describing the precise nature of the continuum. The observed differences between means may not be statistically significant at an acceptable level of probability. Consequently, such observed differences may not be a reliable basis for assigning status ranks.

Where differences between means are not statistically significant at an acceptable alpha level (.05), identical ranks should be assigned to these values to indicate that the positions compared share the same prestige according to the perceptions of Alberta teachers. To permit this refinement of the positional hierarchy, the data involved were submitted to further analysis. The correlated t-test technique was employed to determine the significance of the difference between each adjacent pair of means appearing in the rank order reported in Table 19. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 20. Since the validity of using the t-test in similar situations has been questioned by Glass and Stanley (1970:382), the one-way analysis of variance method followed by the Newman-Keuls multiple comparison procedure was carried out on these data. Tables 21 and 22 report summaries of these analyses to permit comparison of results obtained from application of both multiple comparison procedures to the same data.

Both of the multiple comparison procedures employed provided essentially the same information about differences among the mean prestige scores obtained. Differences significant at the .05 alpha level were discovered between means for five of the six principal subgroup positions, between Elementary principals and teachers of Special Education, Elementary teachers and Department Heads, and Librarians and Vocational Education teachers. Results of the analysis of variance treatment reported in Table 21 produced an F ratio indicating the presence of differentes significant beyond the .001 probability level. Location of statistically significant differences and computing their precise degree of significance was achieved through applying to these data the Newman-Keuls procedure. Table 22 shows in matrix format the results of

Table 20

Results of Analysis Using t-Test Method for Comparisons of PPRS Mean Item Scores Derived from Total Teacher Sample

N = 697

PPRS Item	Positional Subgroup	PPRS Mean Score	Prestige Rank	Comparison by Rank	T-test Value	P
14	Principal - Sr. High	5.02	1			
				1-2	7.04	.000
9	Principal - Jr.-Sr. High	4.84	2			
				2-3	3.42	.000
12	Principal - Elem.-Sr. High	4.74	3			
				3-4	3.00	.003
3	Principal - Jr. High	4.64	4			
				4-5	1.57	.118
7	Principal - Elem.-Jr. High	4.60	5			
				5-6	3.32	.001
2	Principal - Elem.	4.49	6			
				6-7	2.40	.017
11	Teachers - Special Ed.	4.37	7			
				7-8	0.62	.538
18	Teachers - Sec. Academic	4.34	8			
				8-9	1.41	.156
5	Teachers - Elem. (1-6)	4.27	9			
				9-10	2.13	.033
17	Dept. Heads - Curr. Assoc.	4.14	10			
				10-11	1.07	.287
19	Supervisors-Coordinators	4.09	11			
				11-12	0.37	.711
6	Teachers - Fine Arts	4.07	12			
				12-13	1.05	.295
15	Librarians	4.03	13			
				13-14	3.52	.001
16	Teachers - Voc. Ed.	3.89	14			
				14-15	0.39	.699
13	Teachers - Home Ec.	3.88	15			
				15-16	0.83	.408
8	Teachers - Commercial	3.852	16			
				16-17	-0.18	.856
10	Teachers - Ind. Arts	3.846	17			
				17-18	1.20	.231
4	Counsellors - Psychologists	3.79	18			
				18-19	0.51	.613
1	Teachers - Phys. Ed.	3.76	19			

Table 21

Results of One-way ANOVA with Repeated Measures on One Factor for PPRS Total Sample Mean Item Scores

N = 697

PPRS Item	Positional Subgroup	Treatment Mean	Prestige Rank
1	Teachers - Physical Ed.	3.759	19
2	Principals - Elementary	4.489	6
3	Principals - Jr. High	4.643	4
4	Counsellors - Psychologists	3.788	18
5	Teachers - Elementary (1-6)	4.271	9
6	Teachers - Fine Arts	4.073	12
7	Principals - Elementary-Jr. High	4.598	5
8	Teachers - Commercial	3.847	16
9	Principals - Jr.-Sr. High	4.841	2
10	Teachers - Ind. Arts	3.852	17
11	Teachers - Special Ed.	4.367	7
12	Principals - Elementary-Sr. High	4.743	3
13	Teachers - Home Ec.	3.875	15
14	Principals - Sr. High	5.024	1
15	Librarians	4.029	13
16	Teachers - Vocational	3.888	14
17	Dept. Heads - Curric. Assoc.	4.139	10
18	Teachers - Secondary Academic	4.340	8
19	Supervisors - Coordinators	4.095	11

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	P
[illegible]etween People	6954.75	696	9.99		
Within People	12397.19	12546	0.988		
Treatments	1889.25	18	104.96	125.14	.0000
Residual	10507.94	12528	0.839		
Total	19351.94	13242			

Table 22

Comparison Among PPRS Total Sample Means Using Newman-Keuls Procedure Following One-way ANOVA with Repeated Measures on One Factor

N = 697

	PPRS Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1	Teachers - Phys. Ed.	--	**	**	NS	**	**	**	NS	**	NS	**	**	NS	**	**	NS	**	**	**
2	Principals - Elem.			**	**	**	**	*	**	**	**	*	**	**	**	**	**	**	*	**
3	Principals - Jr. High				**	**	**	NS	**	**	**	**	*	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
4	Counsellors - Psychologists					**	**	**	NS	**	NS	**	**	NS	**	**	NS	**	**	**
5	Teachers - Elem. (1-6)						**	**	**	**	**	NS	**	**	**	**	**	*	NS	**
6	Teachers - Fine Arts							**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	NS	**	NS	**	NS
7	Principals - Elem.-Jr. High								**	**	**	**	*	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
8	Teachers - Commercial									**	NS	**	**	NS	**	**	NS	**	**	**
9	Principals - Jr.-Sr. High										**	**	*	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
10	Teachers - Industrial Arts											**	**	NS	**	**	NS	**	**	**
11	Teachers - Special Ed.												**	**	**	**	**	**	NS	**
12	Principals - Elem.-Sr. High													**	**	**	**	**	**	**
13	Teachers - Home Ec.														**	**	NS	**	**	**
14	Principals - Sr. High															**	**	**	**	**
15	Librarians																**	NS	**	NS
16	Teachers - Vocational																	**	**	**
17	Dept. Heads - Curric. Assoc.																		**	NS
18	Teachers - Sec. Academic																			**
19	Supervisors - Coordinators																			--

* Significant beyond .05 level

** Significant beyond .001 level

NS Not Significant at .05 level

comparisons made for all possible paired combinations of means and presents a more comprehensive analysis for describing the "positional hierarchy" presented in Tables 20 and 21.

Examination of the results presented in Table 22 supports the speculation that the "positional hierarchy" in teaching may be more meaningfully described by ordering the subgroup positions into strata or situses according to the ideas advanced by Benoit-Smullyan (1944) and Paul Hatt (1950). Based on this approach and the evidence obtained from the preceding analyses, Table 23 describes characteristics of the positional prestige hierarchy which is most descriptive of the one likely to exist in the Alberta teaching force at the time of the study. The six different positions of principal occupy the five highest ranks in the positional prestige hierarchy. They make up the family category or situs of "Administrators" and also the highest relative status level. The second relative status level includes Special Education, Secondary Academic and Elementary teaching positions. Teachers who hold these positions constitute the "Basic Instructional" family category. They share equal relative status rank (1) within their status level (2) and place sixth in this particular hierarchy. Department Heads, Curricular Associates, Supervisors, Coordinators, Fine Arts teachers and Librarians belong to the "Supervisory-Leadership" situs which occupies the third relative status level and the seventh rank position in the positional hierarchy. The six remaining teaching positions group together to form the "Technical-Vocational" situs because they occupy the fourth relative status level, the eighth and lowest position in the hierarchy, and they also are equally prestigious teaching roles. Technical-Vocational, the descriptive term selected for this situs, is not very suitable to

Table 23

Positional Prestige Hierarchy Resulting from Perceived Differences in Prestige by Total Teacher Sample

N = 697

PPRS Item	Positional Subgroups	Mean Prestige Score	Rank	N-K Comparisons by Rank of MPS			Family Category (Situs)	Relative Status Level	Relative Status Rank in Status Level	Hierarchical Rank
14	Principal - Sr. High	5.02	1	1-2*	1-3(a)* 1-4* 1-5*			1	1.1	1
9	Principal - Jr.-Sr. High	4.84	2	2-3*	1-6*			1	1.2	2
12	Principal - Elem.-Sr. High	4.74	3		2-4* 2-5*		Administrator	1	1.3	3
3	Principal - Jr. High	4.64	4	3-4* 4-5	2-6* 3-5* 3-6*			1	1.4	4
7	Principal - Elem.-Jr. High	4.60	5	5-6*	4-6*			1	1.4	4
2	Principal - Elem.	4.49	6	6-7*				1	1.5	5
11	Teachers - Special Ed.	4.37	7	7-8	7-9		Basic	2	1	6
18	Teachers - Sec. Academic	4.34	8	8-9			Instructional	2	1	6
5	Teachers - Elem. (1-6)	4.27	9	9-10*				2	1	6
17	Dept. Heads-Curric. Assoc.	4.14	10	10-11	10-12 10-13			3	1	7
19	Supervisors-Coord.	4.09	11	11-12	11-13		Supervisory	3	1	7
6	Teachers - Fine Arts	4.07	12	12-13			Leadership	3	1	7
15	Librarians	4.03	13	13-14*						
16	Teachers - Voc. Ed.	3.89	14	14-15	14-16 14-17			4	1	8
13	Teachers - Home Ec.	3.88	15	15-16	14-18		Technical	4	1	8
8	Teachers - Commercial	3.852	16	16-17	14-19 15-17 15-18	16-18 16-19	Vocational	4	1	8
10	Teachers - Ind. Arts	3.846	17	17-18	15-19			4	1	8
4	Counsellors-Psychologists	3.79	18	18-19	17-19		(Other)	4	1	8
1	Teachers - Phys. Ed.	3.76	19					4	1	8

* Indicates difference significant at .05 level or beyond

(a) This particular comparison indicates that the perceived difference in prestige between Principals - Sr. High and Principals - Elem.-Sr. High is statistically significant at the .05 level or beyond.

describe the teaching functions performed by Counsellors-Psychologists and Physical Education teachers. Consequently, these positions have been referred to as "others" belonging to the Technical-Vocational situs.

Since the evidence presented in this section has proven the null hypothesis to be false, the statistical hypothesis 1.1 as stated is tentatively accepted. Significant prestige differences do exist among the positional characteristics investigated.

FINDINGS: PRESTIGE DIFFERENTIALS BASED ON PERCEPTIONS OF MAJOR SUBGROUPS

Hypothesis 1.2: There are significant differences in the amounts of prestige which specified major teacher sub-groupings attribute to subgroups classified according to the specified positional characteristics.

The relatively small size of several positional subgroups made it impractical to include them in any analysis designed to investigate the nature of differences between and among their mean prestige scores on each of the scale items. Consequently, it was found necessary to establish an appropriate number of major groups representative of the 19 teaching positions held in school. This was accomplished by categorizing the various positional subgroups according to titles selected to describe suitably, the main functions performed by subgroup members placed in the respective categories. The five major groups which resulted from collapsing the 19 subgroups are identified for purposes of reporting the results of the analyses of relevant data. These major positional groups are referred to as Principals, Elementary teachers (1-6), Secondary Academic teachers, Secondary Non-academic teachers and the group comprised of Department Heads, Supervisors and Librarians. Structure of the major groups by positional subgroup is detailed in Table 24.

The two-way ANOVA method using repeated measures on one specified factor was employed in analyzing the data obtained for this part of the study. By using this statistical procedure it was possible to determine whether differences between, within and across the 19 mean items scores recorded for each of the five major groups are significant at the probability level selected as acceptable (.05).

Table 24 reports the mean prestige scores attributed to each of the positional teacher subgroups included in the PPRS by each of the major positional groups described above. Examination of the mean prestige scores indicates that prestige estimates in every instance fall into the upper range of the rating scale used. Mean item scores for the Principal group range from a low of 3.712 to a high of 5.288, from 3.756 to 4.885 for Elementary teachers, from 3.613 to 5.094 for members of the Secondary Academic group, from 3.907 to 5.000 for members of the Secondary Non-academic group, and from 3.574 to 5.296 for the group comprised of Department Heads, Supervisors and Librarians. Responses of the latter group were characterized by the largest variation between high and low prestige estimates assigned. The Secondary Non-academic group estimates exhibited the least variation. The five major positional groups were consistent in rating the Senior High School principals highest in prestige. A higher prestige rating was given to this teacher subgroup by the DSL group than by the principals as a group. Principals as a group, however, were not in agreement with other groups in their perceptions about the least prestigious of all subgroups evaluated. Their evaluations placed Home Economics, Vocational Education and Industrial Arts teachers at the

Table 24

Report of Mean Positional Prestige Rating Scale Scores and Corresponding Prestige Rank by Teacher Subgroup for Each of the Five Major Positional Teacher Groupings

PPRS Item	Positional Subgroup	Mean		Professional		Prestige		Rating		Scale	Score
		Princ.(a)	R	Elem. T.(b)	R	S. Acad.(c)	R	S.N-Acad.(d)	R	DSL(e)	R
1	Teachers - Phys. Ed.	3.865	(15)	3.760	(18)	3.613	(19)	4.037	(14)	3.574	(19)
2	Principals - Elem.	4.827	(6)	4.613	(5)	4.325	(7)	4.318	(8)	4.389	(7)
3	Principals - Jr. High	5.077	(3)	4.638	(4)	4.560	(5)	4.505	(4)	4.667	(4)
4	Counsellors-Psychologists	3.885	(14)	3.756	(19)	3.686	(18)	3.907	(19)	3.611	(16)
5	Teachers - Elem. (1-6)	4.212	(7)	4.557	(7)	4.052	(11)	4.037	(14)	3.944	(12)
6	Teachers - Fine Arts	3.962	(13)	4.157	(10)	4.021	(12)	3.981	(17)	3.833	(14)
7	Principals - Elem.-Jr. High	4.981	(5)	4.610	(6)	4.565	(4)	4.439	(5)	4.574	(5)
8	Teachers - Commercial	3.692	(19)	3.854	(17)	3.707	(16)	4.140	(11)	3.852	(13)
9	Principals - Jr.-Sr. High	5.269	(2)	4.749	(2)	4.838	(2)	4.813	(2)	5.019	(2)
10	Teachers - Ind. Arts	3.712	(16)	3.969	(15)	3.691	(17)	4.056	(13)	3.593	(18)
11	Teachers - Special Ed.	4.115	(9)	4.470	(8)	4.298	(8)	4.402	(6)	4.167	(10)
12	Principals - Elem.-Sr. High	5.019	(4)	4.700	(3)	4.733	(3)	4.692	(3)	4.889	(3)
13	Teachers - Home Ec.	3.712	(16)	3.976	(13)	3.743	(15)	3.991	(16)	3.611	(16)
14	Principals - Sr. High	5.288	(1)	4.885	(1)	5.094	(1)	5.000	(1)	5.296	(1)
15	Librarians	3.981	(12)	4.146	(11)	3.932	(13)	3.925	(18)	4.037	(11)
16	Teachers - Vocational	3.712	(16)	3.976	(13)	3.749	(14)	4.131	(12)	3.667	(15)
17	Dept. Heads-Curric. Assoc.	4.019	(11)	3.986	(12)	4.293	(9)	4.243	(10)	4.222	(9)
18	Teachers - Sec. Academic	4.135	(8)	4.244	(9)	4.555	(6)	4.327	(7)	4.389	(7)
19	Supervisors-Coordinators	4.077	(10)	3.944	(16)	4.084	(10)	4.262	(9)	4.519	(6)
	N =	52		287		191		107		54	

PPRS Items listed identify positional subgroups which constitute each major group:
(a) 2, 3, 7, 9, 12 and 14; (b) 5; (c) 11 and 18; (d) 1, 4, 6, 8, 10, 13 and 16; (e) 15, 17 and 19.

R indicates prestige rank () of positional subgroup.

bottom of the positional prestige hierarchy with prestige estimates which resulted in identical mean prestige scores for these teacher subgroups. Evaluations of the other four major groups placed either Physical Education teachers or Counsellors-Psychologists as the teacher subgroup in the same low status.

To determine the nature of relationships among the five sets of major group rank-ordered mean prestige scores reported in Table 24, the Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient (rho) was calculated for each possible comparison of these sets of scores. Values of correlation coefficients (rhos) obtained for these comparisons are shown in Table 25. Results presented in this table indicate that the correlation coefficient values obtained for each of the ten comparisons made is sufficiently high to establish the presence of strong relationships among the five sets of ranked data. Interpreted in another way, these results show that a strong tendency exists among the five major positional groups to rate the 19 positional characteristics similarly.

The statistics reported in Table 26 show the results obtained from testing for the presence of significant differences in the sources specified. Data presented on 'A' (Rating Group) main effects shows that differences between the mean prestige scores of each major group on the 19 subgroups evaluated were not significant at the .05 probability level. Consequently, it can be stated that the five major groups (Principals, Elementary teachers, etc.) do not differ to any appreciable degree with respect to how they used the rating scale to evaluate the 19 subgroups considered. The five groups showed similarity among themselves in using the total range of the rating scale to assign prestige estimates to the various positional subgroups. No major group stood out from the rest as

Table 25

Spearman Rhos Reported for Comparisons of Mean Prestige Subgroup Scores Ranked According to Major Positional Groups

DF = 17

	Principals	Elementary Teachers	Secondary Acad. Teachers	Secondary Non-Acad. Teachers	DSL Group
Principals	---				
Elementary Teachers	0.895				
Secondary Teachers	0.923	0.915			
Secondary Non-Acad. Teachers	0.774	0.749	0.878		
Dept. Heads Supervisors Librarians	0.898	0.818	0.957	0.863	---

Table 26

Summary of Results Obtained Using Two-way ANOVA with Repeated Measures on Factor 'B' for Treatment of Positional Subgroup Mean Scores Derived from Five Major Positional Groups

Levels of 'A' = 5
Repeated Measures = 19
Subjects in 'A' = 52, 287, 191, 107, 54

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Between Subjects	7013.88	690			
'A' Main Effects	14.81	4	3.70	0.363	0.835
Subjects within Groups	6994.38	686	10.20		
Within Subjects	12310.13	12438			
'B' Main Effects	1463.08	18	81.28	98.77	0.0000051
'A' * 'B' Interaction	209.48	72	2.91	3.54	0.0000449

a high, medium or low rater of prestige for the 19 subgroups. When each group's mean prestige rating of individual subgroups is subjected to analysis a different situation results. For 'B' (Group Rated) main effects an F ratio of 98.77, which is significant at an extremely high probability level (much beyond .001), indicates that there are significant differences among the mean prestige scores which have been assigned to each of the teacher subgroups. Observation of the results reported for the 'A * B' interaction provides strong indication that there is almost no tendency among the major groups to maintain a similar rating pattern from subgroup to subgroup. That is, no major group tended to assign the same mean score value to each of the subgroups evaluated. When the mean prestige scores of each major group on each subgroup are compared with those of every other major group on each subgroup, differences are found to be significant well beyond the .05 level.

The information reported in Table 27 is derived from data presented in Table 24. Relative prestige ranks assigned to each of the positional subgroups for each of the major groups were determined by rank-ordering the major groups' mean prestige estimates for each of the 19 subgroups. Table 27 displays the results of this ranking procedure by showing the relative prestige rank that each positional subgroup presumably obtained from each major group. Arrangement of these data in the format used in this table facilitates detection and description of patterns or trends exhibited by Principals, Elementary teachers and other major groups in assessing the prestige of a single subgroup, several subgroups or all subgroups.

Table 27 also reveals that with few exceptions the major groups accorded the subgroups belonging to them, higher amounts of prestige

Table 27

Prestige Rank Assigned to Positional Subgroups by the Five Positional Groups

Prestige Rank*	Positional Subgroup Evaluated																		
	Phys. Educ.	Prin. Elem.	Prin. Jr.H.	Couns. Psych.	Elem. (1-6)	Fine Arts	Prin. El.-Jr.	Comm. Ed.	Prin. Jr.-Sr.	Ind. Arts	Spec. Ed.	Prin. El.-Sr.	Home Ec.	Prin. Sr.H.	Libr.	Voc. Ed.	Dept.Hd. Curr.Ad.	Sec. Acad.	Super. Coord.
1 (Hi)	S N-Ac	Prin	Prin	S N-Ac	El T	El T	Prin	S N-Ac	Prin	S N-Ac	El T	Prin	S N-Ac	Prin	El T	S N-Ac	S Ac	S Ac	DSL
2	Prin	El T	DSL	Prin	Prin	S Ac	El T	El T	DSL	El T	S N-Ac	DSL	El T	DSL	DSL	El T	S N-Ac	DSL	S N-Ac
3	El T	DSL	El T	El T	S Ac	S N-Ac	DSL	DSL	S Ac	Prin	S Ac	S Ac	S Ac	S Ac	Prin	S Ac	DSL	S N-Ac	S Ac
4	S Ac	S Ac	S Ac	S Ac	S N-Ac	Prin	S Ac	S Ac	S N-Ac	S Ac	DSL	El T	Prin	S N-Ac	S Ac	Prin	Prin	El T	Prin
5 (Lo)	DSL	S N-Ac	S N-Ac	DSL	DSL	DSL	S N-Ac	Prin	El T	DSL	Prin	S N-Ac	DSL	El T	S N-Ac	DSL	El T	Prin	El T

* Derived from ranking mean prestige scores reported in Table 24 for each subgroup.

than did other major groups. Some exceptions are apparent. Elementary teachers regard Fine Arts teachers and Librarians as more prestigious than does any other major group. Secondary Academic teachers attributed an amount of prestige to Department Heads and Curricular Associates which essentially placed them in fourth rank. Principals evaluated themselves highest in every instance where this was possible. They also evaluated Physical Education teachers, Counsellors-Psychologists and Elementary teachers higher than those of other major groups which did not include these teachers. Principals as a group attributed the lowest prestige of all groups to teachers of Commercial, Special Education and Secondary Academic subjects. Department Heads and Supervisors subgroups did not receive nearly the same amount of prestige from principals as they attributed to them. The Secondary Non-academic group awarded the lowest amount of prestige (rank five) to four of the six principal subgroups while Elementary teachers responded in like manner for Junior-Senior High and Senior High principals. Elementary and Elementary-Junior High principals achieved a prestige rank of two from evaluations provided by the Elementary teacher group. The latter group awarded the same prestige (rank two) to Commercial, Industrial Arts, Home Economics and Vocational Education subgroups. The Secondary academic group tended to award all subgroups except Department Heads and Fine Arts teachers an amount of prestige which placed them in rank positions three and four. They did not elect to assess any subgroup low enough to locate it in the lowest rank position. Fine Arts teachers, members of the Secondary Non-academic group, were not as important according to this major group as were the other subgroups belonging to it. Members of this major group evaluated Librarians as being fifth in importance along with four principal subgroups. Elementary teachers and the two remaining principal subgroups were seen as being fourth in importance. The major group comprised of Department Heads, Supervisors and Librarians did not award sufficient prestige to achieve first rank to any subgroup except themselves but they did select seven subgroups including Elementary teachers as deserving of the lowest relative prestige rank. They also regard the four most prestigious principal groups as more important by awarding them enough prestige to place them in rank two. Principals' perceptions of this groups' relative prestige are not reciprocal. Department Heads, Supervisors and Librarians attributed an amount of prestige to the subgroups belonging to the Secondary Non-academic group to place them all in the lowest rank (5) but members of the latter major group evaluated members of the DSL in a manner which placed them in rank two.

The findings reported above indicate the null hypothesis to be false. Consequently, it is rejected and hypothesis 1.2, as stated, is tentatively accepted. Significant differences do exist in the amounts of prestige attributed to positional subgroups by major groups.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The analysis of data produced substantial evidence to justify tentative acceptance of hypotheses 1.1 and 1.2 as stated. In most instances the amounts of prestige attributed by teachers in general to the positional subgroups investigated differ at or beyond the .05 level. The nature of the findings serves to remove speculation about public statements negating the presence of a positional prestige hierarchy within the teaching force. More important for teachers, for the professional organization and for other researchers is the description detailing the precise nature of this hierarchical arrangement. That principals would emerge as the most prestigious teacher group does not seem unreasonable nor was it unexpected. However, to discover the presence of a distinctive hierarchy of positions for this function and the fact that it is similarly recognized by principals and teachers in general is noteworthy. The superior prestige attributed to principals by their professional colleagues may be the result of the increasing difficulty of the task, its non-instructional nature, or the control and authority vested in the position. In several instances financial reward may not be a very influential factor since the principal is not necessarily the highest paid member of a school staff. The reason for Counsellors-Psychologists and Physical Education teachers receiving evaluations which placed them at the bottom of the positional prestige hierarchy is difficult to explain unless one reason is that, in general, teachers do not perceive these to be very important functions relative to the others evaluated. Special Education and Elementary (1-6) teachers are much more highly regarded by teachers in general than are teachers serving in supervisory capacities or technical-vocational fields. This could reflect an increased awareness among teachers of a growing public demand for the services of Special Education teachers.

The positional prestige hierarchy which seems to most accurately represent the current perceptions of the Alberta teaching force is presented in Table 23. In general, teachers perceive the arrangement of positions held in school as belonging to four major prestige levels. With the exception of principals' positions which occupy the highest prestige level, positions included in the cluster or family comprising the other levels are assigned the same relative prestige rank. The result is a positional prestige hierarchy comprised of eight prestige ranks but only four status levels.

Results of the analysis of data reported in Tables 24, 26 and 27 constitute a reliable basis for accepting hypothesis 1.2 which predicted that the amounts of prestige attributed by specified major groupings to the positional subgroups evaluated would differ significantly. Findings established this to be so.

Since no statistically significant differences were found among the five positional groups with respect to the way in which members of these groups ranked the 19 positional subgroups, it is apparent that a high degree of agreement exists among teachers regarding the relative statuses of these positions. This finding suggests that the reliability of the positional hierarchy as perceived by teachers in general is reasonably sound. It would also appear from the findings that teachers regard themselves as being well informed about all the school positions in which their colleagues may serve.

Evidence presented in Table 26 established that major group prestige estimates differ significantly (.05 or beyond) between subgroups and also among groups on each subgroup evaluated. Principals may know they enjoy the highest prestige of all positional subgroups and rate themselves accordingly. The tendency in this part of the study for teachers to consistently estimate highly, by comparison, the relative prestige of their own positions is a tendency similar to that reported in related studies completed by Bernbaum and associates (1969) and Humphreys (1970). The fact that there are statistically significant differences in the locations specified in the findings reported suggests that teachers in general do perceive differentials in prestige when teaching positions are considered. The presence of prestige differentials between the various subgroups (see Table 27) suggests that there are likely numerous reasons contributing to this situation. Suppressed resentment may be venting itself in those instances where teachers recognize the improbability of achieving highly prestigious positions or, it may be due to a special competency teachers possess for evaluating the positional characteristics examined.

The complexities and difficulties encountered in reporting and interpreting findings concerned with mean prestige measures can often lead to false or distorted conclusions. Findings based on mean scores should not be construed as precise indicators of opinion for every individual in a group. Mean scores are measures of central tendency and should always be interpreted as such. To illustrate, not all teachers in the total sample thought Physical Education teachers were lowest in relative prestige. Some, for example Physical Education teachers, regarded them as much more prestigious.

SUMMARY

Chapter V presents and discusses the results obtained from the analyses of data related to sub-problems 1(a) and 1(b). These sub-problems were concerned with identifying and describing the nature of perceived prestige hierarchies based on 19 teaching positions in the school. The hierarchical structures which were developed on the basis of perceptions provided by the total teacher sample, and selected subgroupings of this sample, are presented and discussed in detail. The statistical hypotheses developed to investigate sub-problems 1(a) and 1(b) are accepted.

The positional prestige hierarchy produced, initially, from rank ordering the appropriate mean prestige scores obtained from the total sample displays the relative prestige rank of each teaching position evaluated. Principals of Senior High Schools have the highest prestige rank (1) and Physical Education teachers the lowest (19) according to the perceptions of teachers in general. A refined version of this hierarchy was produced after differences among the mean prestige measures used to design this structure were subjected to appropriate statistical treatments. This refined version contains four situses or families of positions arranged according to relative status by situs and within situs. The prestige rank assigned to each position is dependent on the position's location by family category (situs) and relative status within its family category. The six Principal positions considered occupy the highest status level (1) and a similar number of Vocational-Technical positions belong to the lowest status level (4) in this hierarchical arrangement. Elementary, Secondary Academic and Special Education teachers' positions are regarded by teachers in general as being more prestigious than the positions occupied by Supervisors, Coordinators, Department Heads, Curricular Associates, Librarians and Fine Arts teachers since the former group belongs to the second most important status level (2).

Five major sub-groupings of teachers categorized according to similarity of function performed in school were derived from the sample for the purpose of investigating the nature of differences between and among their mean prestige estimates on each of the Positional Prestige Scale items. Relationships and trends which the relevant findings reveal indicate that the mean prestige estimates of major groups tend, consistently, to be in the upper range (3.5 to 6) of the rating scale used. Mean scores of the Secondary Non-academic group exhibit the least variation and those of the Department Head, Supervisor and Librarian group, the largest variation. All major groups attributed the highest prestige to Senior High School principals. The perceptions of Principals as a group differ from those of the other four major groups regarding the least prestigious positional subgroup. According to the views of the Principal group, Vocational Education, Industrial Arts and Home Economics teachers possess equal amounts of prestige, but relative to other positions these are of least importance. The other major groups indicated Physical Education teachers or Counsellors-Psychologists to be the least prestigious positional subgroups of all those considered.

Statistical evidence established that a strong tendency exists among the five major groups to rate the 19 positional subgroups similarly. Their use of the rating scale in this regard did not differ to any appreciable degree. However, when each group's mean prestige rating of individual subgroups was examined, differences among these mean prestige scores which are statistically significant at or beyond the .05 level were found to be present. Data presented in Table 27 show the relative prestige rank for each of the 19 positional subgroups based on evaluations provided by each of the five major groups. These data indicate, that with few exceptions, each positional subgroup was accorded a higher amount of prestige by its parent major group than it was from any other major group. The nature of 95 rankings displayed in Table 27 suggests that much more diversity than conformity exists among major groups regarding the amounts of prestige possessed by the various positional subgroups.

Essentially, the findings for major groups appear to confirm that there is general agreement among them on rating the 19 positional characteristics, but that this is not the case when each major group's mean prestige rating of individual subgroups is subjected to statistical analysis.

CHAPTER VI

PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS AS DETERMINANTS OF PRESTIGE AMONG TEACHERS

This chapter reports on the procedures followed for analysis of data obtained to test hypotheses proposed for dealing with sub-problems 2(a), 2(b), 3(a), 3(b) and 4 of the study. Sub-problems 2(a) and 3(a) were concerned with the identification and description of prestige hierarchies based on selected professional and personal characteristics according to perceptions of the total teacher sample. Sub-problems 2(b) and 3(b) also dealt with prestige hierarchies based on each of the selected professional and personal characteristics, but according to the perceptions of subgroups selected especially to make specified comparisons among these teacher groupings. The four hypotheses developed to investigate the sub-problems referred to above have one thing in common: each predicted that differences in the amounts of prestige attributed to the categories of the characteristics examined are significant according to the perceptions of the teacher groupings concerned. The relative importance of the selected professional and personal characteristics in determining teacher prestige was raised in sub-problem 4. The corresponding hypothesis stated that differences in the amounts of prestige attributed to personal and professional characteristics by teachers in general are significant.

The remainder of this chapter is organized in the following manner. Findings pertinent to the analysis of data concerned with examining the nature of prestige differentials based on total sample perceptions of professional and personal characteristics are presented prior to the findings which deal with the same characteristics as perceived by selected subgroups. Findings from the analysis concerned with testing hypothesis 4 are reported and discussed in the section of this chapter which precedes the summary.

DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURES

Analysis of data obtained for this part of the study involved computing for the sample, mean prestige scores based on the weighted scale responses provided for each of the 43 categories examined. The same measures were computed for each of the subgroups selected on all categories except those listed in item 8 (the seven professional and personal characteristics investigated) of the Personal-Professional Characteristics Rating Scales (PPCRS). Item 8 is included as Part B, Section 2 of the Prestige Differentials and Attitude Inventory (PDAI). Essentially this process amounted to securing mean score measures of perceived prestige on each category examined for each respondent, for the total sample and for each subgroup included in the analysis. Variability of scores from their mean was reported by use of the standard deviation statistic. The practice of ranking mean prestige scores in order of magnitude was adopted to establish the various prestige hierarchies of categories for each characteristic. Rank one was assigned to the mean prestige score having the highest value in the particular set being considered. Refinements to several of these descriptive structures were accomplished by using, where appropriate, One or Two-way ANOVA methods described earlier (Chapter III) to test for the presence of statistically significant differences among specified sets of mean scores. The Newman-Keuls multiple comparison procedure was applied to data following use of the One-way ANOVA treatment. This procedure is used to locate specific differences and determine their statistical significance. Prestige hierarchies based on mean prestige estimates provided by selected subgroups for each characteristic investigated are described and compared on the basis of evidence derived from analysis of these data using the Two-way ANOVA method. Important variations among the ranking practices and patterns displayed by subgroups are shown in tabular arrangement of relative prestige ranks designed to illustrate these phenomena.

To determine and report on the statistical significance of all differences resulting from the numerous comparisons of mean prestige scores which are possible was a task considered beyond the scope of this study. Statistical treatment of the appropriate data was carried out to enable refinement of the four hierarchies produced for the total teacher sample. In addition, subgroup mean prestige estimates were examined to determine if statistically significant differences did exist for comparisons between, within and across selected subgroups involved. Results of these procedures are reported and interpreted in sections of the report which follow.

FINDINGS: PRESTIGE DIFFERENTIALS BASED ON TOTAL SAMPLE PERCEPTIONS

Hypothesis 2.1: There are significant differences in the amounts of prestige which teachers in general attribute to subgroups classified on the basis of the professional characteristics of teaching experience, qualifications, teaching level and official ATA office held.

Hypothesis 3.1: There are significant differences in the amounts of prestige which teachers in general attribute to subgroups classified on the basis of the personal characteristics of age, sex and place of professional preparation.

Professional Characteristics

Table 28 presents the mean prestige score (MPS), standard deviation (SD) and relative prestige rank (PR) obtained for each category of each professional characteristic according to the perceptions of the total teacher sample. Examination of these data indicate the presence of prestige hierarchies for each professional characteristic based on perceptions of teachers in general.

Table 28 also reveals that teachers in general gave colleagues with 11 to 15 years of teaching experience the highest prestige rating and those with less than three years of experience the lowest. Teachers with an experience record ranging between 6 to 20 years were accorded higher prestige than teachers who either exceeded the upper limit or fell below the lower limit of this span. All teachers with the exception of those who possessed less than three years of teaching experience received prestige ratings falling into the high range (above the 3.5 mid-point) of the rating scale used.

Teachers generally regard the Senior High School as the most prestigious teaching level and Division Two (grades 4-6) as the least prestigious. According to their perceptions teaching at the Elementary level (grades 1-3) is slightly more prestigious than teaching at the Junior High School level. The sample indicated that the university qualifications which a teacher possesses are directly related to his relative prestige rank (in direct proportion to the amount held). The

Table 28

Mean Prestige Score (MPS), Standard Deviation (SD) and Prestige Rank (PR) Obtained for Total Sample According to Professional Characteristic Evaluated

N = 690

Professional Characteristic Evaluated	Total Sample		
	MPS	SD	PR
Teaching Experience:			
Less than 3 Years	3.17	1.19	6
3 - 5 Years	3.99	1.02	5
6 - 10 Years	4.58	0.92	3
11 - 15 Years	4.72	0.91	1
16 - 20 Years	4.66	1.06	2
Over 20 Years	4.43	1.28	4
Teaching Level:			
Division I (1 - 3)	4.57	1.27	2
Division II (4 - 6)	4.45	1.08	4
Junior High School (7 - 9)	4.55	1.00	3
Senior High School (10 - 12)	4.75	1.02	1
Teaching Qualifications:			
Less than 3 Years	3.16	1.30	6
Prof. Certificate (3 Years)	4.02	1.06	5
B. Ed. Degree (4 Years)	4.50	0.95	4
Two Bachelor Degrees (5 Years)	4.67	0.95	3
M. Ed. Degree (6 Years)	4.90	1.00	2
More than 6 Years	4.94	1.19	1
ATA Office Held:			
No ATA Office	3.70	1.23	6
President - ATA Local	4.25	1.11	4
Chairman - PD Committee	4.17	1.10	5
Chairman - SN Committee	4.38	1.14	2
PEC Member	4.30	1.17	3
President - Prov. Assn.	4.51	1.29	1

most prestige was awarded to teachers with more than six years of university preparation while the least amount was awarded to those with minimal preparation (three years). Teacher presidents of the provincial association were accorded the highest prestige rating (rank one) of the five official ATA positions evaluated by teachers. Chairmen of Salary Negotiating Committees were evaluated higher than members of Provincial Executive Council, presidents of ATA locals and Chairmen of Professional Development Committees as these groups' ratings placed them in relative prestige ranks three, four and five respectively. Teachers who did not hold, or had not held any official ATA position placed at the bottom of this particular prestige hierarchy in rank six, the least prestigious position in this hierarchy.

Total sample mean prestige scores reported in Table 28 vary from a low of 3.16 (teachers with less than three years of university preparation) to a high of 4.94 (teachers with more than six years of university preparation). In all cases except two (teachers with less than three years of university preparation and teachers with less than three years of teaching experience) mean prestige estimates achieved values exceeding 3.5, the mid-point on the rating scale used by the total teacher sample.

When the prestige hierarchies for the four professional characteristics described above are considered together, teachers with 11 to 15 years of teaching experience, more than six years of university preparation, teaching senior high school and with a record of service in an official ATA office emerge as the high prestige teacher group according to the perceptions of their colleagues. The low prestige group in this instance consists of Division Two (4-6) teachers with the least amount of teaching experience and university preparation who have not held any official ATA office.

Table 29 and the table references which accompany it, report the results of analysis of data carried out to determine the presence of statistically significant differences among the various total sample mean prestige scores obtained for each category of each professional characteristic considered and to identify and describe the nature of these differences. Refined versions of the prestige hierarchies which take into account the statistical significance of differences between adjacent prestige ranks are presented in the same table. The prestige hierarchy for teaching experience now consists of five statuses according to the perceptions of teachers generally. There is no difference in the amount of prestige teachers associate with having 11 to 15 years of teaching experience or 16 to 20 years of teaching experience, but there is in the case of each of the other experience categories. Since Division One (1-3) and Junior High School (7-9) teachers are groups with equal prestige in the minds of teachers as a group, the teaching level hierarchy consists of three rather than four statuses. A five rather than six position hierarchy for teaching qualifications is the result of teachers, in general, attributing the same amount of prestige to colleagues possessing six of more years of university preparation. The absence of differences which are statistically significant at the .05 level among the mean prestige estimates awarded to four of the six ATA offices held categories shows that a three position hierarchy exists for this characteristic. Generally, teachers regard presidents of the provincial association as the most prestigious group and teachers who have not served in any official association office as the least prestigious group.

Table 29

Prestige Hierarchies Obtained for Professional Characteristics after Analysis of Data Using One-Way ANOVA Followed by N-K Procedure

N = 690

Professional Characteristic Evaluated	MPS	PR	ANOVA F Ratio(a)	Ranks of MPS Compared by (N-K)[b]	Prestige Hierarchy
Teaching Experience:					
11-15 Yr.	4.72	1	385.23*	1-2	1
16-20 Yr.	4.66	2		2-3*	1
6-10 Yr.	4.58	3		3-4*	2
Over 20 Yr.	4.43	4		4-5*	3
3-5 Yr.	3.99	5		5-6*	4
Less than 3 Yr.	3.17	6			5
Teaching Level:					
Senior High School (10-12)	4.75	1	19.73*	1-2*	1
Division I (1-3)	4.57	2		2-3	2
Junior High School (7-9)	4.55	3		3-4*	2
Division II (4-6)	4.45	4			3
Teaching Qualifications:					
D.Ed. or Ph.D. Degree	4.94	1	454.10*	1-2	1
M.Ed. Degree (6 Yr.)	4.90	2		2-3*	1
Two Bachelor Degrees (5 Yr.)	4.67	3		3-4*	2
B.Ed. Degree (4 Yr.)	4.50	4		4-5*	3
Professional Cert. (3 Yr.)	4.02	5		5-6*	4
Less than 3 Yr.	3.16	6			5
ATA Office Held:					
Pres. Prov. Assn.	4.51	1	85.12*	1-2*	1
Chairman - Sal. Neg. Com.	4.38	2		2-3	2
Prov. Ex. Council Member	4.30	3		3-4	2
Pres. ATA Local	4.25	4		4-5	2
Chairman - Prof. Dev. Com.	4.17	5		5-6*	2
No ATA Office Held	3.70	6			3

* Significant at the .05 level or beyond

(a) See Tables 55, 56, 57 and 58 (Appendix D) for ANOVA results

b See Table 59 (Appendix D) for results of all N-K comparisons

Personal Characteristics

This section of the study reports the findings of analyses related to the three personal characteristics selected for investigation: age, sex and place of professional preparation of the teacher.

Table 30 displays prestige hierarchies based on selected personal characteristics which exist in the Alberta teaching force according to the perceptions of teachers in general when their mean prestige scores are ranked to determine the relative status position of each variable comprising the set considered.

Age -- Total Sample Perceptions. According to the perceptions of the sample, teachers over 60 years old are the least prestigious age category and those between 36 and 50 years old the most prestigious category. The two age categories representing the extremes, youngest and oldest, were accorded the lowest amounts of prestige by teachers as a group. Teachers between 25 and 35 years old were perceived by teachers in general as having about the same amounts of prestige as the most prestigious category (a mean prestige score of 4.54 compared to 4.57). The hierarchy of age subgroups arranged from most to least prestigious on the basis of total sample perceptions locates teachers between 25 and 50 years old in the two highest prestige positions (ranks one and two) and teachers over 60 years old in the lowest prestige position (rank five).

Sex of Teacher -- Total Sample Perceptions. Comparison of the mean prestige scores presented in Table 30 for male and female teachers indicates that teachers, in general, regard male teachers as the more prestigious group.

Table 30

Mean Prestige Score (MPS), Standard Deviation (SD) and Prestige Rank (PR) Obtained for Total Sample According to Personal Characteristic Evaluated

N = 690

Personal Characteristic Evaluated	Total Sample		
	MPS	SD	PR
Age:			
Under 25 Years Old	3.69	1.21	4
Between 25 - 35 Years Old	4.54	1.01	2
Between 36 - 50 Years Old	4.57	0.96	1
Between 51 - 60 Years Old	3.98	1.15	3
Over 60 Years Old	3.26	1.37	5
Sex of Teacher:			
Male	4.62	1.04	1
Female	4.45	1.08	2
Place of Professional Preparation:			
Alberta	4.66	1.09	1
Other Canadian Province	4.33	0.99	2
United States	3.60	1.21	4
England	3.87	1.22	3
India	2.90	1.26	7
West Indies	2.95	1.26	6
Other Countries	3.14	1.19	5

Place of Professional Preparation -- Total Sample Perceptions. According to the data presented in Table 30, teachers, in general, indicated that teachers prepared in Alberta are more prestigious than those prepared in any of the other six locations evaluated. Teachers prepared in other Canadian provinces received the next highest rating while those prepared in the West Indies and India were evaluated so as to place them in the two lowest ranks of this seven level hierarchy. Teachers who obtained their teaching credentials in England are, according to teachers in general, a more prestigious group than those prepared in American institutions.

Personal Characteristics Prestige Hierarchies -- Refined Versions

Table 31 and the references it includes report the results of analyses of data carried out to determine the presence of statistically significant differences among the various total sample mean prestige scores obtained for each category of each personal characteristic evaluated and to identify and describe the nature of these differences. Refined versions of the prestige hierarchies which take into account the statistical differences between adjacent prestige ranks are also presented in Table 31. The modified hierarchy for age characteristics now consists of four statuses according to the perceptions of teachers in general. Essentially, there is no difference in the amount of prestige teachers associate with age categories included in the 25 to 50 age spread, but there is in the case of the other three age groups. The hierarchy which describes the relative status of male and female categories remains unchanged since the difference between the mean prestige scores obtained for these categories is significant beyond the .05 level. Generally, teachers attribute more prestige to males when evaluating the characteristic

Table 31

Prestige Hierarchies Obtained for Personal Characteristics after Analysis of Data Using One-Way ANOVA Followed by Newman-Keuls Procedure

N = 690

Personal Characteristic Evaluated	MPS	PR	ANOVA F Ratio(a)	Ranks of MPS Compared by (N-K)b	Prestige Hierarchy
Age:					
Between 36 - 50 Years Old	4.57	1		1-2	1
Between 25 - 35 Years Old	4.54	2		2-3*	1
Between 51 - 60 Years Old	3.98	3	275.55*	3-4*	2
Under 25 Years Old	3.69	4		4-5*	3
Over 60 Years Old	3.26	5			4
Sex of Teacher:					
Male	4.62	1	20.05*	1-2*	1
Female	4.45	2			2
Place of Professional Prep.:					
Alberta	4.66	1		1-2*	1
Other Canadian Province	4.33	2		2-3*	2
England	3.87	3		3-4*	3
United States	3.60	4	464.07*	4-5*	4
Other Countries	3.14	5		5-6*	5
West Indies	2.95	6		6-7	6
India	2.90	7			6

* Significant at the .05 level or beyond

(a) See Tables 60, 61 and 62 (Appendix D) for ANOVA results

b See Table 63 (Appendix D) for results of all N-K comparisons

of sex. Since teachers who received their professional preparation in the West Indies or India are regarded as equally prestigious groups by teachers in general, this particular hierarchy now consists of six rather than seven statuses which do not deviate from the order described for the earlier version.

On the basis of the findings presented for the three personal characteristics investigated teachers, in general, indicated that the high prestige group of teachers are males between 25 and 50 years of age who have obtained their university preparation in Alberta. The low prestige group consists of females under 25 years of age who have received their university preparation in either the West Indies or India.

FINDINGS: PRESTIGE DIFFERENTIALS BASED ON SELECTED SUBGROUP PERCEPTIONS

Hypothesis 2.2: There are significant differences in the amounts of prestige which selected teacher groupings attribute to subgroups classified on the basis of the professional characteristics of teaching experience, qualifications, teaching level and official ATA office held.

Hypothesis 3.2: There are significant differences in the amounts of prestige which selected teacher groupings attribute to subgroups classified on the basis of the personal characteristics of age, sex and place of professional preparation.

Professional Characteristics

Table 32 reports the results of the evaluations made by each selected subgroup on the same sets of characteristics considered by the

Table 32

Mean Prestige Score (MPS), Standard Deviation (SD) and Prestige Rank (PR) Obtained for Selected Subgroups According to Professional Characteristic Evaluated

Professional Characteristic Evaluated	Teacher Subgroup Categories*	Teacher Subgroups																	
		A (N= 59)			B (N=143)			C (N=154)			D (N= 99)			E (N= 80)			F (N=107)		
		MPS	SD	PR	MPS	SD	PR	MPS	SD	PR	MPS	SD	PR	MPS	SD	PR	MPS	SD	PR
Teaching Experience:																			
Less than 3 Years	A	3.44	1.16	6	3.41	1.21	6	3.23	1.23	6	2.98	1.22	6	3.00	1.13	6	2.96	1.04	6
3 - 5 Years	B	4.31	0.86	4	4.28	1.06	4	4.12	0.97	5	3.78	1.06	5	3.75	1.00	5	3.72	0.90	5
6 - 10 Years	C	4.69	0.86	2	4.71	0.96	1	4.73	0.88	2	4.56	0.87	4	4.34	0.91	4	4.37	0.93	4
11 - 15 Years	D	4.73	1.00	1	4.60	0.98	2	4.80	0.84	1	4.88	0.88	1	4.63	0.85	3	4.68	0.97	3
16 - 20 Years	E	4.54	1.15	3	4.31	1.10	3	4.58	1.00	3	4.87	1.07	2	4.83	0.90	1	4.92	1.06	2
Over 20 Years	F	4.22	1.34	5	3.99	1.37	5	4.22	1.25	4	4.72	1.25	4	4.65	1.17	2	4.94	1.13	1
Teaching Level:		G (N=319)			H (N=323)														
Division I (1-3)	G	4.86	1.21	1	4.29	1.28	3												
Division II (4-6)	G	4.67	1.03	2	4.21	1.09	4												
Junior High School (7-9)	H	4.56	1.05	4	4.53	0.97	2												
Senior High School (10-12)	H	4.61	1.11	3	4.89	0.93	1												
Teaching Qualifications:		J (N=201)			K (N=277)			L (N=101)			M (N= 63)								
Less than 3 Years	J	3.90	1.21	6	2.92	1.18	6	2.84	1.41	6	2.52	0.96	6						
Prof. Certificate (3 Years)	J	4.34	1.02	5	3.95	1.02	5	3.88	1.18	5	3.60	0.99	5						
B.Ed. Degree (4 Years)	K	4.53	1.01	3	4.59	0.90	4	4.51	0.94	4	4.08	0.99	4						
Two Bachelor Degrees (5 Years)	L	4.50	1.13	4	4.76	0.85	3	4.87	0.81	3	4.49	0.93	3						
M.Ed. Degree (6 Years)	L	4.63	1.24	2	4.98	0.89	2	5.12	0.80	2	4.95	0.89	1						
More than 6 Years	M	4.68	1.42	1	5.04	1.10	1	5.21	0.93	1	4.92	1.14	2						
ATA Office Held:		O (N=423)			P (N=219)														
No ATA Office	O	3.87	1.20	6	3.37	1.21	6												
President - ATA Local	P	4.17	1.16	4	4.35	0.99	4												
Chairman - PD Committee	P	4.10	1.15	5	4.28	0.97	5												
Chairman - SN Committee	P	4.33	1.18	2	4.52	1.05	2												
PEC Member	P	4.21	1.23	3	4.48	1.05	3												
President - Prov. Assn.	P	4.39	1.31	1	4.69	1.27	1												

* Letters in this column identify the particular professional characteristic(s) of the teacher group(s) comprising each teacher subgroup. e.g. Teacher subgroup G includes all Division I and Division II teachers in the sample.

total teacher sample. Examination of these data reveals situations where ratings between and among the various subgroups are similar and situations where they are different. Details pertaining to the composition of each selected subgroup are provided in Table 32. For example, subgroup G consists of 319 elementary grade teachers derived from combining Division One and Division Two teachers.

Comparisons of the ranking tendencies exhibited among subgroups are reported at this time to describe the general nature of relationships among hierarchies developed from merely rank ordering subgroup mean prestige scores after determining whether differences statistically significant at the .05 level do exist among these measures. Statistically significant differences were not located and specifically identified in this instance.

The statistics reported in Table 64 (Appendix D) show the results obtained from testing for the presence of significant differences among mean prestige scores obtained for the "Teaching Experience" characteristic. Results obtained from application of the analysis of variance method are reported by referring to 'A' main effects, 'B' main effects and 'A * B' interaction. It should be noted that in all cases 'A' main effects describes the subgroups doing the rating (evaluators) and 'B' main effects describes the teacher subgroups being rated (evaluated). 'A * B' interaction measures total variability and refers to the amount of deviation of all subgroup mean scores from the overall mean score. Data presented on 'A' main effects indicate that differences between the mean prestige scores of each teacher subgroup on the six experience variables evaluated are not significant at the .05 probability level. In other words the six teacher subgroups do not differ with respect to how they used the rating scale to evaluate the experience subgroups rated. No subgroup stood out from the rest as a high, medium or low rater of prestige on the six experience subgroups considered. Data reported for 'B' main effects indicate that there are significant differences among the teacher subgroups' mean prestige scores which they have assigned to each of the subgroups evaluated. According to the results reported for 'A * B' interaction, when the mean prestige scores of each teacher subgroup on each experience subgroup are compared with those of every other teacher subgroup on each experience subgroup, differences significant beyond the .05 level are present. This indicates that there is a tendency among the six subgroups to vary their rating pattern from category to category. Table 65 (Appendix D) shows the same situation as that described above prevails for the three teacher subgroups involved in assessing categories associated with the "ATA Office Held" characteristic. For the two other professional characteristics, teaching level and teaching qualifications, Table 66 (Appendix D) and 67 (Appendix D) reveal a statistically significant difference (.05 or beyond) for 'A' (raters) main effects. In both instances the subgroups do differ with respect to how they used the rating scale to evaluate the categories involved. These selected subgroups showed little or no similarity in using the total range of the rating scale to assign prestige estimates to the subgroups evaluated. These results are recognized in subsequent discussions of findings.

Experience -- Selected Subgroup Assessments. Data presented in Table 33 are obtained by assigning prestige ranks to mean prestige scores reported in Table 32 for each teaching experience category according to their relative values. Prestige rank one derives from the highest mean prestige score in a set of scores. The purpose of Table 33 is to show

Table 33

Prestige Rank Assigned to Each Experience Category by Each Selected Teacher Subgroup

	Experience Category Evaluated					
Prestige Rank*	Less than 3 Yr. T. Exp.	3-5 Yr. T. Exp.	6-10 Yr. T. Exp.	11-15 Yr. T. Exp.	16-20 Yr. T. Exp.	Over 20 Yr. T. Exp.
1	Less than 3 Yr.	Less than 3 Yr.	6-10	11-15	Over 20	Over 20
2	3-5	3-5	3-5	6-10	11-15	11-15
3	6-10	6-10	Less than 3 Yr.	Less than 3 Yr.	16-20	16-20
4	16-20	11-15	11-15	Over 20	6-10	6-10 Less than 3 Yr.
5	11-15	16-20	Over 20	16-20	Less than 3 Yr.	**
6	Over 20	Over 20	16-20	3-5	3-5	3-5

* Derived from ranking appropriate subgroup mean prestige scores reported in Table 32.

** Mean prestige scores for 6-10 and less than 3 categories are identical.

relationships in ranking patterns among and between the various subgroups that evaluated the teaching experience subgroups.

According to the data presented in Table 33 the six subgroups representative of the six teaching experience categories investigated tended to vary more in ratings given to teachers belonging to experience categories beyond the five year experience limit. Teachers with the least amount of experience rated themselves highly and gave teachers with most experience the least amount of prestige. Most experienced teachers indicated the reverse of this ordering. With the exception of teachers in the three to five and 16 to 20 experience categories, each subgroup attributed highest prestige to itself. The three to five year experience category was rated second in three cases and sixth in the same number of instances. Generally, the rating patterns of subgroups whose members possessed less than six years of experience and those who possessed 16 or more years of experience were similar to one another.

Comparisons of subgroup rating tendencies made on the basis of ranking the mean prestige scores reported in Table 32 for each subgroup on each set of categories (categories listed for each professional characteristic) reveal findings somewhat contradictory in nature to those reported for data arranged according to the relative value of subgroup mean prestige scores on each category of a characteristic evaluated. This finding is elaborated below.

Data presented in Table 32 reveal that subgroups whose members possessed teaching experience within the 11 to over 20 year interval rated themselves highest while teachers with less than six years of teaching experience rated themselves relatively low. The six subgroups were consistent in evaluating teachers with less than six years of experience at the bottom (rank six) of this prestige hierarchy. Evaluations by teachers with more than ten years of experience placed the six to ten year experience subgroup in fourth rank compared to first or second rank based on evaluations by the three other teaching experience categories. The greatest variation among subgroups occurred in their perceptions concerning the prestige of teachers with more than 20 years of experience. Ratings became progressively higher as the amount of experience held by the subgroup evaluating this category increased. No pair of the subgroup hierarchies computed for the teaching experience characteristic showed identical rankings, nor was any of the six identical to the one computed for the total sample prestige estimates shown in Table 28. Most of the differences in assigned ranks among subgroups and between subgroups (Table 32) and total sample (Table 28) occurred for the three subgroup categories with the most experience (11 to more than 20 years).

Teaching Level -- Selected Subgroup Assessments. According to data presented in Table 34 the Elementary teacher subgroup evaluated all teaching levels except the Senior High School level higher than the subgroup composed of Secondary teachers.

Table 34

Prestige Rank Assigned to Each Teaching Level Category by Each Selected Teacher Subgroup

Prestige Rank*	Teaching Level Category Evaluated Teachers Div. One	Teachers Div. Two	Teachers Jr. High School	Teachers Sr. High School
1	Elementary Teachers	Elementary Teachers	Elementary Teachers	Secondary Teachers
2	Secondary Teachers	Secondary Teachers	Secondary Teachers	Elementary Teachers

* Derived from ranking appropriate mean prestige scores reported in Table 32.

Data referring to ranks presented in Table 32 for these categories reveal that there is no consistency between elementary and secondary teacher subgroups in evaluating the relative prestige of the four teaching level categories. Comparison of these data with corresponding data presented for the total sample in Table 28 indicates that the findings are similar regarding their evaluations of teaching level categories. Elementary teachers rated their categories highest and Secondary teachers did the same for their categories. Secondary teachers rated the Senior High School and Division Two (4-6) categories as one and four respectively as did the total teacher sample. Elementary teachers did not concur with any of the perceptions of the total teacher sample regarding the relative status of these four categories.

Teacher Qualifications -- Selected Subgroup Assessments. Ranks assigned to the six teaching qualifications categories according to the relative amount of prestige each selected subgroup perceived for them are shown in Table 35.

Table 35

Prestige Rank Assigned to Each Teaching Qualifications Category by Each Selected Teacher Subgroup

	Teaching	Qualifications	Category	Evaluated		
Prestige Rank*	Less than 3 Yr.	Prof. Cert.	B.Ed. Deg. (4 Yr.)	Two Bach. Deg. (5 Yr.)	M.Ed. Deg. (6 Yr.)	More than 6 Yr.
1	Less than 4 Yr.	Less than 4 Yr.	4 Yr.	5-6 Yr.	5-6 Yr.	5-6 Yr.
2	4 Yr.	4 Yr.	Less than 4 Yr.	4 Yr.	4 Yr.	4 Yr.
3	5-6 Yr.	5-6 Yr.	5-6 Yr.	Less than 4 Yr.	More than 6 Yr.	More than 6 Yr.
4	More than 6 Yr.	More than 6 Yr.	More than 6 Yr.	More than 6 Yr.	Less than 4 Yr.	Less than 4 Yr.

* Derived from ranking appropriate mean prestige scores reported in Table 32.

The data show that teachers with less than four years of university preparation gradually decreased the amount of prestige given as the amount of university preparation increased. Teachers with the highest qualifications were consistently low raters of the qualifications characteristic compared to other subgroups and even for themselves. Each subgroup except the latter, ensured itself of the highest relative prestige rank by awarding to itself more prestige than it gave to any of the other categories evaluated. The teacher subgroup holding Bachelor of Education degree qualifications (four years) evaluated five of the six qualifications categories in a manner which placed them in prestige rank two.

When these same data are examined according to ranks presented in Table 32 the evaluations submitted by each of the four selected subgroups on the set of six categories indicate remarkable similarity both among groups and between each group. In every instance except four, ranks are identical and in these four instances the difference in rank is restricted to one. Viewed from this perspective, teachers, regardless of university qualifications held by the individual, believe that the amount of prestige associated with these qualifications is directly proportional to the amount of this characteristic possessed by the teacher. All except three mean prestige estimates reported in Table 32 for this professional characteristic exceed the mid-point value of 3.5 on the rating scale used. In these instances, teachers with three or more years of university preparation rated teachers with less preparation well below 3.5.

Official ATA Office Held -- Selected Subgroup Assessments. Table 36 presents data to indicate that members of the teacher subgroup who had held or were holding some official ATA office considered this to be a more prestigious activity than the teachers who had not, a group almost double in membership (423 to 219). Teachers belonging to the latter subgroup awarded more prestige to themselves (3.87) than did their counterparts (3.37).

Table 36

Prestige Rank Assigned to Each ATA Office Held Category
by Each Selected Teacher Subgroup

	ATA	Office	Held	Category	Evaluated	
Prestige Rank*	No ATA Office	Pres. ATA Local	PD Chairmen	SN Chairmen	PEC Members	Pres. Prov. Assn.
1	N.O.A.(a)	H.O.	H.O.	H.O.	H.O.	H.O.
2	H.O.(b)	N.O.A.	N.O.A.	N.O.A.	N.O.A.	N.O.A.

* Derived from ranking appropriate subgroup mean prestige scores reported in Table 32

(a) Subgroup consisting of teachers who never held any ATA office

(b) Subgroup consisting of teachers who had or were holding an ATA office

Interpreting the same data from the ranks recorded in Table 32 provides a much different set of findings. Prestige hierarchies developed from ordering the prestige ranks derived from mean prestige scores for teachers who did not hold any official ATA office and for those who had or did are identical in structure. The perceptions of teachers belonging to these two groupings do not differ regarding the relative status of the six categories evaluated. Observation of differences between the mean prestige scores obtained for teachers who did not hold an official

ATA office and those who did suggests that such differences are likely to be statistically significant (.05 or beyond) ones. Accordingly, the more positive perceptions of office holders would be established.

Personal Characteristics

The findings reported in this section of the chapter are based on the analyses of data obtained to examine the perceptions of selected subgroups on the three personal characteristics investigated: age, sex and place of professional preparation of the teacher.

The statistics reported in Table 68 (Appendix D) show the results obtained from testing for the presence of significant differences among mean prestige scores obtained for the "age" characteristic. Data presented on 'A' main effects (subgroups doing the rating) indicates that differences between the mean prestige scores of each teacher subgroup on the five age variables evaluated are not significant at the .05 probability level. Consequently, it can be stated that the five teacher subgroups do not differ with respect to how they used the prestige rating scale to evaluate the age categories rated. Each subgroup demonstrated a tendency to consistently use particular levels of the rating scale during the rating procedure. Data reported for 'B' main effects (subgroups being rated) and for 'A * B' interaction (total variance) indicates the presence of differences significant beyond the .05 probability level. There are significant differences among the teacher subgroups' mean prestige scores which they have attributed to each of the subgroups evaluated. Also, when the mean prestige scores of each teacher subgroup are compared with those of every other teacher subgroup on each age category evaluated, differences significant beyond the .05 level are present indicating a tendency among the five teacher subgroups to modify their rating pattern from category to category. Evidence presented in Table 69 (Appendix D) shows the situation described in Table 68 (Appendix D) also obtains for teacher subgroups that evaluated sex of teacher categories. Table 70 (Appendix D) reports the 'A' main effects (rating groups) variation to be significant beyond the .05 level indicating that the teacher subgroups which evaluated the place of professional preparation categories do differ in the way they used the prestige rating scale to evaluate these variables. At least one subgroup rated categories consistently high, medium or low. Statistics reported in Table 70 (Appendix D) for 'B' main effects (groups rated) and 'A * B' interaction are essentially the same as those reported for these variations in Tables 68 (Appendix D) and 69 (Appendix D). Consequently, the interpretations of these data are applicable to the same variations which have been reported for the age and sex characteristics.

Table 37 displays the personal characteristics prestige hierarchies which exist in the Alberta teaching force according to the perceptions of the selected teacher subgroups. The basis for developing these structures is merely an ordering of mean prestige scores from highest to lowest for the purpose of determining the relative status of each category comprising the set evaluated.

Age -- Selected Subgroup Assessments. The only subgroup classified on the basis of age which is in complete agreement with the total sample evaluation (see Table 30) regarding the most prestigious age category (36 to 50 years old) is the 36 to 50 age subgroup. Both age subgroups, the youngest and oldest, rated themselves relatively low, (ranks three and four respectively) compared to teachers in the 25 to 50 age range (rank one in each case). The general tendency was for the various age

Table 37

Mean Prestige Score (MPS), Standard Deviation (SD) and Prestige Rank (PR) Obtained for Selected Subgroups According to Personal Characteristic Evaluated

Personal Characteristic Evaluated	Teacher Subgroup Categories*	Teacher Subgroups														
		Q (N= 59)			R (N=276)			S (N=200)			T (N= 88)			U (N= 19)		
		MPS	SD	PR	MPS	SD	PR	MPS	SD	PR	MPS	SD	PR	MPS	SD	PR
Age:																
Under 25 Yr. Old	Q	4.34	1.11	3	3.87	1.20	3	3.37	1.19	4	3.57	1.06	5	3.32	1.57	5
Between 25-35 Yr. Old	R	4.76	0.95	1	4.72	0.97	1	4.40	1.02	2	4.34	0.88	3	4.11	1.49	3
Between 36-50 Yr. Old	S	4.42	0.97	2	4.54	0.94	2	4.62	0.98	1	4.60	0.90	1	4.42	1.34	1
Between 51-60 Yr. Old	T	3.64	1.28	4	3.86	1.10	4	4.00	1.16	3	4.40	0.92	2	4.37	1.38	2
Over 60 Yr. Old	U	2.75	1.35	5	3.13	1.33	5	3.27	1.39	5	3.65	1.11	4	4.05	1.47	4
Sex of Teacher:		V (N=285)			W (N=357)											
Male	V	4.79	0.91	1	4.52	1.12	2									
Female	W	4.22	1.09	2	4.65	1.00	1									
Place of Professional Prep.:		X (N=455)			Y (N=128)			Z (N= 59)								
Alberta	X	4.80	1.02	1	4.43	1.10	2	4.14	1.32	2						
Other Canadian Province	Y	4.31	0.94	2	4.55	1.01	1	4.14	1.18	2						
United States	Z	3.57	1.18	4	3.45	1.14	4	4.07	1.35	3						
England	Z	3.84	1.23	3	3.61	1.14	3	4.57	1.04	1						
India	Z	2.88	1.26	7	2.70	1.17	7	3.47	1.22	5						
West Indies	Z	2.93	1.24	6	2.74	1.24	6	3.47	1.36	5						
Other Countries	Z	3.11	1.19	5	2.92	1.11	5	3.72	1.27	4						

* Letters in this column identify the particular personal characteristic(s) of the teacher group(s) comprising each teacher subgroup. e.g. Teacher subgroup Z includes all teachers prepared in the United States, England, India, West Indies and other countries.

sub-groupings of teachers to rate other age subgroups differently from teachers in general (see Table 30) but quite similarly among themselves. For example, the two subgroups comprised of teachers under 36 years old produced identical prestige hierarchies as did the two subgroups comprising the upper limits (over 50) of the age continuum.

Data presented in Table 38 indicates that younger teachers (under 36) attributed a greater amount of prestige to being in this category than in categories above 50 years of age. Older teachers (over 50) responded the same way for their categories. In fact, every teacher subgroup except the 25 to 35 age category rated itself highest.

Table 38

Prestige Rank Assigned to Each Age Category Evaluated by Each Selected Teacher Subgroup

Prestige Rank*	Age	Category		Evaluated	
	Under 25 Years Old	25-35 Years Old	36-50 Years Old	51-60 Years Old	Over 60 Years Old
1	Under 25	Under 25	36-50	51-60	Over 60
2	25-35	25-35	51-60	Over 60	51-60
3	51-60	36-50	25-35	36-50	36-50
4	36-50	51-60	Over 60 Under 25	25-35	25-35
5	Over 60	Over 60	---	Under 25	Under 25

* Derived from ranking appropriate subgroup mean prestige scores reported in Table 37.

Teachers in the middle age range (36 to 50) regard teachers over 60 and under 25 as equally prestigious categories but not as prestigious as the others. Teachers over 60 received the lowest relative prestige estimates from the under 25 and 25 to 35 subgroups while teachers under 25 were evaluated as having the same relative status by the two subgroups comprised of teachers over 50. No subgroup agreed completely with any other subgroup on the relative status of the subgroups evaluated.

Sex of Teacher -- Selected Subgroup Assessments. Ranks presented for subgroup prestige estimates in Table 39 indicate that both male and female teachers evaluated their own sex category as the higher in prestige.

Male teachers are in agreement with the appraisal given by the total teacher sample, but female teachers are not. Males are rated higher than females. (See Table 30)

Table 39

Prestige Rank Assigned to Each Sex Category
Evaluated by Male and Female Subgroups

Prestige Rank*	Sex Category Evaluated: Male Teachers	Sex Category Evaluated: Female Teachers
1	Male Teachers	Female Teachers
2	Female Teachers	Male Teachers

* Derived from ranking appropriate mean prestige scores reported in Table 37.

Place of Professional Preparation -- Selected Subgroup Assessment. Data presented in Table 40 show that teachers followed the tendency reported for most other characteristics considered, that of rating the characteristic of their own particular subgroup higher than others rated it on the prestige rating scale used. Teachers belonging to the three selected subgroups that evaluated place of professional preparation characteristics followed this pattern. Teachers prepared in other countries consistently rated teachers prepared outside of Canada higher than did members of the subgroups prepared in Canada. The teacher subgroup prepared in Alberta attributed more prestige to out of country subgroups than did the subgroup prepared in other Canadian provinces.

The largest teacher subgroup (Alberta -- 455), by a substantial margin, agreed completely, and not surprisingly so, with the relative importance accorded to each of the teacher subgroups evaluated by the total teacher sample. (See Table 30) The evaluations provided by teachers belonging to the other Canadian provinces subgroup produced a prestige hierarchy identical to the one computed for the Alberta subgroup except for the rating which placed them rather than Alberta prepared teachers in the highest relative rank position. The subgroup of teachers comprised of those prepared outside of Canada registered a much different set of perceptions on this characteristic. According to evaluations provided by members of this subgroup, teachers prepared in England rated above teachers prepared in Canada and although teachers prepared in the West Indies and India were given the lowest prestige rating it was an equivalent one. Consequently, the hierarchy which describes the perceptions of teachers comprising the outside of Canada subgroup concerning the relative status of the places of professional preparation evaluated,

Table 40

Prestige Rank Assigned to Each Place of Professional Preparation Category Evaluated by Each Selected Teacher Subgroup

	Place of Professional Preparation Category Evaluated						
Prestige Rank*	Alberta	Other Can. Prov.	United States	England	India	West Indies	Other Countries
1	Alberta	Other Can. Prov.	Other Country	Other Country	Other Country	Other Country	Other Country
2	Other Can. Prov.	Alberta	Alberta	Alberta	Alberta	Alberta	Alberta
3	Other Country	Other Country	Other Can. Prov.	Other Can. Prov.	Other Can. Prov.	Other Can. Prov.	Other Can. Prov.

* Derived from ranking appropriate mean prestige scores reported in Table 37.

consists of five rather than seven prestige ranks arranged in a different order from those computed from prestige scores provided by each of the other selected subgroups.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The findings presented on professional and personal characteristics for the total teacher sample and the various subgroups are based on evidence obtained from the two approaches used to interpret data. Essentially, one explained relationships between and among prestige ranks derived from ordering mean prestige scores on sets of categories prior to testing for the presence of statistically significant differences. The other approach followed the same procedure after subjecting the same measures to statistical treatment. Wherever feasible, findings derived from the latter procedure are emphasized as the more reliable.

Since the findings establish that differences in the amounts of prestige attributed by teachers in general and selected teacher subgroups are significant for the categories of professional and personal characteristics evaluated by these teacher groupings, the null hypotheses are rejected and the statistical hypotheses 2.1, 2.2, 3.1 and 3.2 are tentatively accepted. Consequently, it can be stated that teachers are accorded different prestige by other teachers when they evaluate particular personal and professional characteristics of teachers. One finding emerged consistently from processing data on professional and personal characteristics. Teacher groupings exhibited a strong tendency to estimate highly, by comparison, the relative prestige of those characteristics which they possessed. Although this may not be an unanticipated outcome, it is now documented. Some findings which may be regarded as unusual and interesting are discussed below.

Teacher groups having less than five years of teaching experience were rated lowest in prestige by the sample but teachers in the more than 20 years experience category were not given a relatively high rating. In other words, to belong to the most experienced category was not considered as being most prestigious. Teachers possessing anywhere from six to 20 years of experience received higher prestige ratings. It could be that teachers generally consider members in the over 20 years of experience category to be "out of touch" or less susceptible to desirable change. Senior High School is the most prestigious teaching level but Division One (1-3) is not the least prestigious; teachers generally regard Division Two as the lowest prestige level. Being associated with the most mature students may be an influence favouring the Senior High School teachers but it does not explain the case for Division One teachers. It could be that extra recognition is accorded by colleagues to teachers serving at the most difficult and least desirable teaching level. The prestige hierarchy computed for teaching qualifications illustrates that the amount of prestige teachers attribute to categories of this characteristic increases in accordance with the amount of university qualifications held by the teacher with one exception. Teachers did not perceive any prestige differential between holders of masters and doctoral degrees. Possibly this is due to the absence of any appreciable number of teachers with Doctor of Philosophy qualifications serving at the school system level. As a group, teachers indicated that service in an official ATA office was more important than no service in an association office, but they also indicated that the only ATA office which had more prestige (statistically speaking) than the others considered was the senior post of Association president.

Younger teachers indicated that they were a more prestigious group than older teachers but older teachers disagreed. This finding may serve to reinforce the claim purporting an increasing militancy among the "new breed" of teacher. Oldest teachers in particular, and the youngest group are regarded by the teaching body as being lowest in this particular prestige hierarchy. Probably a superior capacity for difficult work coupled with a dynamic approach to it accounts to some degree for this perception. The total teacher sample indicated that male teachers were a more prestigious group than female teachers. Male teachers agreed but female teachers did not. At the present time, teachers in general, appear to regard males as the more dominant sex in teaching. No doubt this situation results from the fact that males occupy the great majority of senior positions in the school and school system. Teachers indicated that they feel strongly concerning the relative prestige of places of professional preparation. Prestige wise each group regards his own category as more worthy than any other. This is probably a typical reaction in this instance but to be certain such is the case for Alberta teachers suggests a possible source of the internal conflicts which emerge in teaching from time to time. Also the fact that a representative cross-section of the Alberta teaching force rated Alberta preparational institutions highest in prestige — suggests that these teachers may be well-informed about the shorter preparational period required for certification in other provinces and countries. The possibility also exists that Alberta teachers are not well enough informed about teacher preparation programs in other locations to make objective comparisons.

The existence of firmly established professional and personal prestige differentials based on teachers' perceptions indicate a need for teachers and administrators to become cognizant of their nature and the implications they may have for the local education endeavour.

Four conclusions which are supported by the findings presented for this section of the study are as follows:

1. Prestige hierarchies based on the professional characteristics of teaching experience, teaching qualifications, teaching level and official ATA office held exist (at the time of the present study) within the Alberta teaching force according to the perceptions of Alberta teachers.
2. Prestige hierarchies based on the professional characteristics of teaching experience, teaching qualifications, teaching level and official ATA office held exist (at the time of the present study) within the Alberta teaching force according to the perceptions of particular teacher subgroups.
3. Prestige hierarchies based on the personal characteristics of age, sex of teacher and place of professional preparation exist (at the time of the present study) within the Alberta teaching force according to the perceptions of Alberta teachers.
4. Prestige hierarchies based on the personal characteristics of age, sex of teacher and place of professional preparation exist (at the time of the present study) within the Alberta teaching force according to the perceptions of particular teacher subgroups.

FINDINGS: RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF PROFESSIONAL-PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Hypothesis 4: There are significant differences in the importance which teachers attribute to selected professional and personal characteristics as determinants of prestige.

Results of the analysis of data carried out to determine the relative importance of the professional and personal characteristics investigated are interpreted and reported here. The prestige hierarchy presented in Table 41 indicates the relative importance of these professional and personal characteristics according to the perceptions of Alberta teachers. Comparisons between all paired combinations of mean

Table 41

Results of Analysis of Data Using One-way ANOVA Followed by Newman-Keuls (N-K) Procedure to Determine Relative Importance of Professional and Personal Characteristics According to Perceptions of Total Sample

N = 690

Characteristic Evaluated	MPS	SD	Prestige Rank	ANOVA F Ratio$^{(a)}$	Ranks of MPS Compared by (N-K)^{b}	Prestige Hierarchy
Teaching Experience	4.461	1.29	1		1-2*	1
Teaching Qualifications	4.291	1.30	2		2-3*	2
Place of Prof. Preparation	3.733	1.42	3		3-4*	3
Age of Teacher	3.467	1.44	4	(322.71)*	4-5*	4
Teaching Level of Teacher	3.346	1.55	5		5-6*	5
Sex of Teacher	2.542	1.49	6		6-7	6
Official ATA Office Held	2.432	1.39	7			6

* Significant at .05 level or beyond

(a) Complete results of ANOVA treatment are reported in Table 71 (Appendix D)

b See Table 72 (Appendix D) for results of all N-K comparisons

prestige scores indicated that all but one of the differences between these measures are significant at or beyond the .05 level. Teaching experience obtained the highest position in this hierarchy (1) and two characteristics, sex of teacher and official ATA office held, were accorded the lowest (6). Teaching qualifications held by the teacher placed in rank position two compared to rank position five for teaching level, the remaining professional characteristic evaluated. Place of professional preparation was awarded more prestige than the age characteristic and considerably more than teaching level and ATA office held characteristics. Teachers, in general, considered age to be a more important characteristic than sex of teacher but not as important as place of professional preparation.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Hypothesis 4 predicted that the amount of prestige attributed by teachers, in general, to each of the professional and personal characteristics differed significantly. The findings which resulted from the analysis of relevant data indicate that the null hypothesis is false. Consequently, the statistical hypothesis is tentatively accepted. However, some explanation for this decision is warranted. With the exception of sex of teacher and ATA office held, differences in the amounts of prestige attributed by teachers to professional and personal characteristics are statistically significant at the .05 level. Consequently, hypothesis 4 is accepted with some reservation. Since the differences in prestige accorded to all the other characteristics are statistically significant it does not seem reasonable to reject the statistical hypothesis on the basis of the one difference which did not achieve signifance at the critical level selected (.05).

The fact that teachers, in general, regard teaching experience as a more important quality than teaching qualifications may come as a surprise and shock to many outside the profession. Teachers did not indicate that teaching qualifications were unimportant. Evidence presented in this report indicates the contrary to be the case. However, it is apparent that teachers regard teaching experience as a very important criterion in teaching. This outcome suggests a reason for the firm stand taken by teachers to maintain and improve the experience increment structure which is a part of teachers' working agreements. Place of professional preparation emerged as a relatively important personal characteristic due possibly to the comparatively lengthy formal preparation period required for certification as a teacher in the Province of Alberta. Compared to the other characteristics considered, sex of teacher did not turn out to be a relatively important quality in determining prestige among teachers. Age was given substantially more recognition.

On the basis of the professional-personal characteristics hierarchy presented the highest status teachers in the minds of colleagues possess considerable teaching experience and advanced teaching qualifications obtained from an Alberta university.

SUMMARY

A total of 31 prestige hierarchies (including refined versions) are presented in this chapter of the report. These structures illustrate the relative importance of each professional and personal characteristic considered according to the perceptions of the total teacher sample and various other teacher groupings selected to evaluate these seven characteristics. The last prestige hierarchy presented (see Table 41) shows the relative importance of these particular characteristics which resulted from the assessment provided by the total teacher sample. Teachers as a group indicated that the most prestigious collectivity of colleagues is Senior High School teachers possessing between 11 and 20 years of teaching experience, six or more years of university preparation and a record of service in an official ATA office. The personal qualities of this high prestige group indicate that members are males between the ages of 25 and 50 who have been prepared in Alberta universities. Similarities and differences among the selected teacher subgroups and between these groupings and the total teacher sample exist for each of the seven characteristics. A strong tendency was observed for members of the various teacher subgroups to consistently rate the subgroup they belonged to as highest on every characteristic they evaluated. In most instances mean prestige estimates awarded by teacher groupings tended to be in the upper range (above 3.5) of the prestige scale used.

Total sample mean prestige estimates range from a low of 2.90 (teachers prepared in India) to a high of 4.66 (teachers prepared in Alberta) for personal characteristics and from a low of 3.16 (teachers with less than three years university preparation) to a high of 4.94 (teachers with more than six years university preparation) for professional characteristics. Teacher subgroup mean prestige estimates range from a low of 2.70 (teachers prepared in India) to a high of 4.80 (teachers prepared in Alberta) for personal characteristics and from a low of 2.52 (teachers with less than three years university preparation) to a high of

5.21 (teachers with more than six years university preparation) for professional characteristics.

When teachers as a group assessed the relative importance of the seven professional and personal characteristics considered, teaching experience and qualifications emerged as the two most important characteristics and sex of teacher and official ATA office held as the two least important characteristics.

CHAPTER VII

ATTITUDINAL DIFFERENCES AMONG HIGH AND LOW PRESTIGE TEACHER GROUPS AND AMONG STATUS CONGRUENT AND INCONGRUENT TEACHER GROUPS

This chapter reports the findings related to sub-problems 5(a), 5(b), 5(c), 5(d) and 6 of the study. It was hypothesized that the attitudes of professionalism held by members of the various high and low prestige groups and teachers experiencing status congruence and status incongruence would differ significantly. Teacher subgroups evaluated by the total teacher sample as the highest and lowest prestige categories of each characteristic (see Chapters V and VI) constitute the high and low prestige groups selected for the comparisons made in this part of the study.

The five dimensions of professionalism comprising the two attitude rating scales used are detailed in the chapter reporting on instrumentation (Chapter III). The referent for each theoretical dimension, and the abbreviated terms, used in this chapter to identify these dimensions are as follows:

Dimension: The professional organization (ATA) -- (Organization)
The profession as a major referent -- (Profession)
Belief in public service -- (Public Service)
Belief in self-regulation -- (Self-Regulation)
Autonomy -- (Autonomy)

Following a brief outline of the procedure followed for analysis of the data, the remainder of this chapter is organized to present, separately, findings pertaining to attitudinal differences between and among high and low prestige groups on each characteristic investigated, on two combinations of these characteristics and on the attitudinal differences among status congruent and incongruent teacher groups. The findings are discussed together in a section which precedes the summary.

DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURES

Mean attitude scores, based on the sum of weighted scale responses, were computed for each respondent on each of the five dimensions of professionalism evaluated. Similar Likert-type equal appearing interval scales were used to rate attitudes on the two inventories prepared for data gathering purposes. Since the number of items contained in the Organization dimension of the Teacher Attitude Inventory (Part C of the PDAI) exceeded the number contained in each of the dimensions included in the Revised Hall Inventory (Part D of the PDAI), comparisons of mean attitude scores between and among the five dimensions required these data to be standardized. Mean attitude scores for each respondent in the sample were standardized on the basis of mean 50 and standard deviation ten. This enabled comparisons to be made between and among the attitude measures obtained for high and low prestige groups on the various dimensions of professionalism. The One-way ANOVA method was used to test for the presence of statistically significant differences among the means being considered. If the results of this treatment indicated the presence of differences significant at or beyond the .05 level, the relevant data were analyzed according to the Newman-Keuls multiple comparison procedure in order that these differences could be located and described.

FINDINGS: ATTITUDINAL DIFFERENCES BASED ON POSITIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Hypothesis 5.1: The attitudes of high and low prestige teacher groups classified on the basis of specified positional characteristics, differ significantly on the dimensions of professionalism.

The source and composition of high and low prestige groups selected to test hypothesis 5.1 are described here. These classifications correspond to the positional groupings of teachers which resulted from the analysis reported in Table 23. Essentially, these are the same teacher groupings which the total teacher sample recognized as the high and low prestige groups based on positional characteristics. The Administrator category includes all the school principals in the study sample. Basic Instructional, the other high prestige group, includes the Elementary and Secondary Academic teacher respondents. Supervisors, Coordinators, Department Heads, Curricular Associates, Librarians and Fine Arts teachers make up the Supervisory-Leadership group which is a low prestige classification. The Vocational-Technical-Other category is comprised of Home Economics, Commercial, Industrial Arts, Vocational and Physical Education teachers and Counsellors.

Table 42 reports the results obtained from the analysis of data on professionalism attitudes for the high and low prestige groups described above. Results of the application of the analysis of variance treatment to data indicate the presence of significant differences between mean attitude scores on only the Public Service dimension of professionalism. According to the results of the Newman-Keuls comparisons of ordered means for this dimension, the difference between mean

Table 42

Mean Attitude Score (MAS), Standard Deviation (SD), Results of One-way ANOVA and Newman-Keuls Comparison of Ordered Means by Dimension of Professionalism for High and Low Prestige Groups Classified on the Basis of Selected Positional Characteristics

Prestige Groups		MAS (Adjusted) by Dim. of Prof.					SD by Dim. of Prof.				
		Org.	Prof.	Pub. Ser.	Self-Reg.	Aut.	Org.	Prof.	Pub. Ser.	Self-Reg.	Aut.
A. Administrators N = 52	- Hi	49.10	47.96	49.68	50.08	51.80	9.79	8.67	9.56	9.40	10.04
B. Basic Instructional N = 317	- Hi	49.86	50.88	49.84	50.18	50.34	9.85	9.56	10.29	10.74	10.28
C. Super-Leadership N = 91	- Lo	50.08	50.19	47.83	49.57	48.04	10.70	11.44	9.09	10.00	9.35
D. Voc.-Tech.-Other N = 123	- Lo	50.09	48.78	51.95	49.38	50.03	9.57	10.33	9.91	9.39	9.84
	Total	49.87	50.07	49.96	49.91	50.05	9.89	9.99	10.01	9.91	10.04

Source of Variance		MS	DF	F	P
Dimension:	Org.	13.33	3	0.14	0.935
	Prof.	216.33	3	2.18	0.090
	Pub. Ser.	302.67	3	3.05	0.028
	Self-Reg.	23.00	3	0.23	0.874
	Aut.	185.00	3	1.84	0.139

Table 42 (continued)

N-K Comparisons			C	A	B	D
Dimension:		MAS (Adjusted)	47.83	49.68	49.84	51.95
Public Service	C.	47.83	0.00	1.85	2.01	4.12*
	A.	49.68		0.00	0.16	2.27
	B.	49.84			0.00	2.11
	D.	51.95				0.00

* These means differ significantly at the .05 level or beyond

attitude scores obtained for the Supervisory-Leadership and Vocational-Technical groups is significant at the .05 level. The attitudes held by members of these two low prestige groups regarding the importance of their profession to society, reveals that Vocational-Technical teachers feel more strongly about the indispensability of their profession to society than do teachers who belong to the Supervisory-Leadership category. They constitute the group with the more positive professional attitude in this instance.

Findings indicate that the attitudes held by the four groups referred to above are essentially the same for the other attributes of professionalism examined. Inspection of the mean attitude scores reported in Table 42 shows that the high prestige groups tended to rate belief in Self-Regulation and Autonomy higher than the low prestige groups. However, the low prestige groups rated items included in the Organization dimension higher than did their high prestige colleagues.

FINDINGS: ATTITUDINAL DIFFERENCES BASED ON PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Hypothesis 5.2: The attitudes of high and low prestige teacher groups classified on the basis of teaching experience, qualifications, teaching level and ATA office held differ significantly on the dimensions of professionalism.

Teaching Experience

The data reported in Table 43 indicate that on the basis of teaching experience attitudes of the most and least prestigious categories of teachers differ significantly on the first three dimensions of professionalism considered (Organization, Profession and Public Service)

Table 43

Mean Attitude Score (MAS), Standard Deviation (SD), Results of One-way ANOVA and Newman-Keuls Comparison of Ordered Means by Dimension of Professionalism for High and Low Prestige Groups Classified on the Basis of Teaching Experience

Prestige Groups	MAS (Adjusted) by Dim. of Prof.					SD by Dim. of Prof.				
	Org.	Prof.	Pub. Ser.	Self-Reg.	Aut.	Org.	Prof.	Pub. Ser.	Self-Reg.	Aut.
A. Experience (11-20 Yr.) - Hi N = 193	48.66	52.37	49.01	49.97	50.62	9.04	10.10	9.14	9.48	9.56
B. Experience (Over 20 Yr.)- Lo N = 115	52.04	49.14	51.48	51.42	49.51	9.14	9.37	9.54	9.78	9.54
Total	49.92	50.34	49.93	50.51	50.21	9.19	9.74	9.33	9.59	9.54

Source of Variance		MS	DF	F	P
Dimension	Org.	820.88	1	9.96	0.002
	Prof.	745.81	1	8.11	0.005
	Pub. Ser.	439.19	1	5.09	0.025
	Self-Reg.	150.00	1	1.63	0.203
	Aut.	89.31	1	0.98	0.323

Table 43 (continued)

N-K Comparisons			A	B
Dimension:		MAS (Adjusted)	48.66	52.04
Organization	A.	48.66	0.00	3.34*
	B.	52.04		0.00
			B	A
Dimension:			49.14	52.37
Profession	B.	49.14	0.00	3.24*
	A.	52.37		0.00
			A	B
Dimension:			49.01	51.48
Public Service	A.	49.01	0.00	2.47*
	B.	51.48		0.00

* These means differ significantly at the .05 level or beyond

but do not on Self-Regulation and Autonomy. The low prestige group possesses a more supportive attitude toward the Professional Organization than does the high prestige group. On the set of items (the Profession dimension) which measured attitudes toward the profession (no specific reference was made to the ATA), a reversal in feelings occured which showed the high prestige teacher group to be more profession oriented. Mean attitude scores obtained for these two groups on Belief in Self-Regulation and Autonomy differed but not at a statistically significant level of .05. Nevertheless, there is some evidence to suggest that the low prestige groups expressed the strongest belief in Self-Regulation and the high prestige group showed more concern for matters associated with Professional Autonomy if the critical level of .05 is extended.

Teaching Qualifications

Table 44 reveals that the only dimension of professionalism on which the attitudes of high and low prestige teacher groups differ significantly is the second dimension (Profession). Attitudes expressed by both groups with respect to the ATA, specifically, are very similar, but this is not the case when the profession as a major organizational referent is considered. The low prestige group attaches more importance to this dimension of professionalism than does the high prestige group. Differences between mean attitude scores for these groups on each of the Public Service, Self-Regulation and Autonomy dimensions are not significant at the selected level of .05 but in two cases the differences approach, closely, this limit. Furthermore, mean attitude scores of the low prestige group exceeded those of the high prestige group on the Organization, Profession and Autonomy dimensions while those of the high prestige group were higher on the Public Service and Self-Regulation dimensions.

Table 44

Mean Attitude Score (MAS), Standard Deviation (SD), Results of One-way ANOVA and Newman-Keuls Comparison of Ordered Means by Dimension of Professionalism for High and Low Prestige Groups Classified on the Basis of Teaching Qualifications

Prestige Groups	MAS (Adjusted) by Dim of Prof. Org.	Prof.	Pub. Ser.	Self-Reg.	Aut.	SD by Dim. of Prof. Org.	Prof.	Pub. Ser.	Self-Reg.	Aut.
A. Qualifications (6 or more Yr.) - Hi N = 81	49.60	45.29	51.14	51.40	48.88	10.99	9.06	10.93	11.78	10.62
B. Qualifications (Less than 4 Yr.) - Lo N = 203	49.96	51.06	48.65	50.22	51.22	8.51	8.83	9.46	9.58	9.25
Total	49.86	49.41	49.36	50.56	50.55	9.25	9.23	9.93	10.23	9.68

Source of Variance		MS	DF	F	P
Dimension:	Org.	7.69	1	0.09	0.765
	Prof.	1924.62	1	24.35	0.000
	Pub. Ser.	358.19	1	3.65	0.057
	Self-Reg.	79.81	1	0.76	0.384
	Aut.	317.81	1	3.41	0.066

Table 44 (continued)

N-K Comparisons			A	B
Dimension:		MAS (Adjusted)	45.29	51.06
Profession	A.	45.29	0.00	5.77*
	B.	51.06		0.00

---

* These means differ significantly at the .05 level or beyond

Teaching Level

The attitudes of high and low teacher prestige groups differ significantly on beliefs associated with the Organization and Self-Regulation dimensions of professionalism. Data presented in Table 45 indicate that Senior High School teachers as a group hold more favourable attitudes toward The Alberta Teachers' Association (the Organization dimension) than do teachers engaged at the Division Two (grades 4-6) level. Results obtained for these same groups with respect to the Profession dimension which was designed to measure similar feelings about the formal professional organization, in general, do not reflect any similarity in the expressed attitudes of these teacher groupings. The difference in attitudes held on the Profession dimension by practitioners belonging to the high and low prestige levels is not significant at the .05 level. An identical situation exists for attitudes examined by the Public Service and Autonomy dimensions.

The attitudes of Senior High School teachers and Division Two teachers differ significantly on the notion of colleague control (Self-Regulation). The attitudes expressed by Senior High School teachers exhibit the higher degree of professionalism regarding self-control over their work. Teachers practicing at this instructional level are more firmly convinced than are the upper elementary group that authority for judging the proper worth of their services should reside with them as a group. Data presented in Table 45 indicate that both groups hold similar views on professional autonomy.

ATA Office Held

For purposes of the analysis of data reported in this section the high prestige group includes that portion of the total sample which

Table 45

Mean Attitude Score (MAS), Standard Deviation (SD), Results of One-way ANOVA and Newman-Keuls Comparison of Ordered Means by Dimension of Professionalism for High and Low Prestige Groups Classified on the Basis of Teaching Level

Prestige Groups	MAS (Adjusted) by Dim. of Prof.					SD by Dim. of Prof.				
	Org.	Prof.	Pub. Ser.	Self-Reg.	Aut.	Org.	Prof.	Pub. Ser.	Self-Reg.	Aut.
A. Level (Sr. High) - Hi N = 159	51.41	49.05	51.97	51.73	49.17	8.88	9.63	10.84	9.70	10.05
B. Level (Div. Two - Lo 4-6) N = 191	48.26	50.69	49.94	49.60	49.33	10.87	9.77	9.67	10.06	8.94
Total	49.69	49.95	50.87	50.57	49.26	9.93	9.71	10.24	9.93	9.44

Source of Variance		MS	DF	F	P
Dimension:	Org.	862.63	1	8.92	0.003
	Prof.	243.50	1	2.49	0.116
	Pub. Ser.	356.62	1	3.42	0.065
	Self-Reg.	395.75	1	4.04	0.045
	Aut.	2.44	1	0.03	0.869

Table 45 (continued)

N-K Comparisons			B	A
Dimension:		MAS (Adjusted)	48.26	51.41
Organization	B.	48.26	0.00	3.15*
	A.	51.41		0.00
			B	A
Dimension:			49.60	51.73
Self-Reg.	B.	49.60	0.00	2.13*
	A.	51.73		0.00

* These means differ significantly at the .05 level or beyond

indicated that they hold, or had held, at least one of the official ATA positions listed under this professional characteristic. The group identified by teachers, in general, as the low prestige grouping is comprised of teachers who did not at anytime hold an official ATA position.

Results of the analysis of data presented in Table 46 show that the attitudes of high and low prestige groups classified on the basis of service in an official ATA office differ significantly only on the two dimensions of professionalism (Organization and Profession) concerned with commitment to the formal organization. Since differences between the mean attitude scores on the three remaining measures are not statistically significant at the .05 level, this suggests that beliefs held by both teacher groups regarding these aspects of professionalism are essentially the same.

Data presented in Table 46 on ATA office held show the attitudinal differences between the two particular groups of teachers to be opposite in nature from what might normally be expected. The attitude of teachers who held office in the professional organization is not as supportive of the organization as the attitude of teachers without this experience. Logically, each group should maintain a similar posture when evaluating the profession as a major referent but in the case of these two groups this situation does not prevail. The attitudes of the high prestige group (teachers who held an ATA office) are more profession oriented than are the attitudes of their counterparts when identification with the professional organization is considered. Practitioners belonging to the first group exhibited a greater awareness of the value to be derived from a professional organization than did teachers belonging to the second group.

Table 46

Mean Attitude Score (MAS), Standard Deviation (SD), Results of One-way ANOVA and Newman-Keuls Comparison of Ordered Means by Dimension of Professionalism for High and Low Prestige Groups Classified According to ATA Office Held

	MAS (Adjusted) by Dim. of Prof.					SD by Dim. of Prof.				
Prestige Groups	Org.	Prof.	Pub. Ser.	Self-Reg.	Aut.	Org.	Prof.	Pub. Ser.	Self-Reg.	Aut.
A. Some ATA Office - Hi N = 245	47.71	42.70	49.21	50.05	50.02	10.14	8.74	10.51	10.37	10.23
B. No ATA Office - Lo N = 440	51.27	45.14	50.44	49.97	49.99	9.71	9.64	9.70	9.80	9.89
Total	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00

Source of Variance		MS	DF	F	P
Dimension:	Org.	1988.00	1	20.42	0.000
	Prof.	9016.00	1	103.57	0.000
	Pub. Ser.	233.00	1	2.33	0.127
	Self-Reg.	1.00	1	0.01	0.920
	Aut.	1.00	1	0.01	0.920

Table 46 (continued)

N-K Comparisons			A	B
Dimension:		MAS (Adjusted)	47.71	51.27
Organization	A.	47.71	0.00	3.56*
	B.	51.27		0.00
			B	A
Dimension:			45.14	52.71
Profession	B.	45.14	0.00	7.57*
	A.	52.71		0.00

* These means differ significantly at the .05 level or beyond

FINDINGS: ATTITUDINAL DIFFERENCES BASED ON PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Hypothesis 5.3: The attitudes of high and low prestige teacher groups classified on the basis of age, sex and place of professional preparation differ significantly on the dimensions of professionalism

Age

Data presented in Table 47 on the Organization and Profession dimensions indicate that the attitudes of teachers between 25 and 50 years old differ significantly from those of teachers over 60 years old on beliefs associated with the value of a professional organization. Younger teachers, the high prestige group according to the perceptions of teachers generally, exhibited more positive attitudes of professionalism than did teachers over 60 on the Organization and Profession dimensions. Members of this high prestige teacher group expressed more positive attitudes toward the ATA and to the professional organization as an important entity than did teachers over 60 years of age. Comparisons of mean attitude scores for these particular teacher groupings suggest that older teachers are more firmly committed to beliefs concerned with authority over their own work (Self-Regulation) and freedom to make decisions about their work (Autonomy). However, such inferences are without much foundation since differences between mean attitude scores on these characteristics are not significant at the .05 level. A similar situation prevails for the Public Service dimension of professionalism. Consequently, the attitudes of teachers between 25 and 50 years of age are no different from those of teachers over 60 years of age with respect to the attributes of professionalism examined by items comprising the

Table 47

Mean Attitude Score (MAS), Standard Deviation (SD), Results of One-way ANOVA and Newman-Keuls Comparison of Ordered Means by Dimension of Professionalism for High and Low Prestige Groups Classified According To Age

Prestige Groups	MAS (Adjusted) by Dim. of Prof.					SD by Dim. of Prof.				
	Org.	Prof.	Pub. Ser.	Self-Reg.	Aut.	Org.	Prof.	Pub. Ser.	Self-Reg.	Aut.
A. 25-50 Yr. Old - Hi N = 506	50.25	50.44	50.23	49.70	49.95	10.30	10.15	10.27	10.09	10.36
B. Over 60 Yr. Old - Lo N = 120	47.54	45.94	48.97	51.05	51.59	9.06	8.47	9.26	9.56	8.63
Total	49.73	49.58	49.98	49.96	50.26	10.11	10.00	10.08	9.99	10.05

Source of Variance		MS	DF	F	P
Dimension:	Org.	713.00	1	7.03	0.008
	Prof.	1967.00	1	20.25	0.000
	Pub. Ser.	153.00	1	1.50	0.220
	Self-Reg.	176.00	1	1.76	0.185
	Aut.	262.00	1	2.59	0.108

Table 47 (continued)

N-K Comparisons			B	A
Dimension:		MAS (Adjusted)	47.54	50.25
Organization	B.	47.54	0.00	2.71*
	A.	50.25		0.00
			B	A
Dimension:			45.94	50.44
Profession	B.	45.94	0.00	4.50*
	A.	50.44		0.00

* These means differ significantly at the .05 level or beyond

Public Service, Self-Regulation and Autonomy dimensions of the revised Hall Attitude Scale.

Sex of Teacher

Male teachers are a more prestigious group than female teachers according to the views expressed by the total teacher sample. Data presented in Table 48 indicate that the attitudes of male and female teachers differ significantly on two of the dimensions of professionalism considered. The mean attitude score reported for female teachers on the Profession dimension reveals that the attitude held by this group concerning the worth of the professional organization is more positive than is the attitude of males in this regard. Females expressed more positive feelings about the value of the professional organization than males. However, the data reported for the Belief in Public Service dimension indicate that male practitioners expressed stronger beliefs than did their female colleagues about their indispensability and the benefit society derives from teacher services. Apparently, the male segment of the profession is more highly committed to upholding the service ideal than is the female segment. Attitudes of male and female teachers do not differ significantly with respect to the Professional Organization, Belief in Self-Regulation or Autonomy in Decision-Making.

Place of Professional Preparation

The attitudes expressed on the five dimensions of professionalism by the high prestige group of teachers consisting of 480 practitioners with professional preparation in Alberta are compared with those of 66 teachers who received their professional preparation outside of Canada.

Results of the analysis of data reported in Table 49 established

Table 48

Mean Attitude Score (MAS), Standard Deviation (SD), Results of One-way ANOVA and Newman-Keuls Comparison of Ordered Means by Dimension of Professionalism for High and Low Prestige Groups Classified According to Sex of Teacher

Prestige Group		MAS (Adjusted) by Dim. of Prof.					SD by Dim. of Prof.				
		Org.	Prof.	Pub. Ser.	Self-Reg.	Aut.	Org.	Prof.	Pub. Ser.	Self-Reg.	Aut.
A. Male N = 311	- Hi	49.94	48.46	50.89	50.16	49.32	10.71	10.08	10.28	10.15	9.79
B. Female N = 374	- Lo	50.05	51.28	49.26	49.88	50.56	9.40	9.78	9.73	9.85	10.16
	Total	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00

Source of Variance		MS	DF	F	P
Dimension:	Org.	2.00	1	0.02	0.888
	Prof.	1344.00	1	13.67	0.000
	Pub. Ser.	451.00	1	4.53	0.034
	Self-Reg.	14.00	1	0.14	0.709
	Aut.	261.00	1	2.61	0.106

Table 48 (continued)

N-K Comparisons			A	B
Dimension:		MAS (Adjusted)	48.46	51.28
Profession	A.	48.46	0.00	2.81*
	B.	51.28		0.00
			B	A
Dimension:			49.26	50.89
Pub. Service	B.	49.2[illegible]	0.00	1.63*
	A.	50.89		0.00

* These means differ significantly at the .05 level or beyond

Table 49

Mean Attitude Score (MAS), Standard Deviation (SD) and Results of One-way ANOVA for High and Low Prestige Groups Classified According to Place of Professional Preparation of Teacher

Prestige Group		MAS (Adjusted) by Dim. of Prof.					SD by Dim. of Prof.				
		Org.	Prof.	Pub. Ser.	Self-Reg.	Aut.	Org.	Prof.	Pub. Ser.	Self-Reg.	Aut.
A. Alberta N = 480	- Hi	50.01	50.25	49.78	49.99	49.72	10.14	9.79	9.85	10.09	10.02
B. Outside Country N = 66	- Lo	50.24	48.13	49.72	50.61	50.76	9.19	9.47	9.25	9.76	9.27
	Total	50.04	50.00	49.78	50.06	49.85	10.01	9.76	9.76	10.04	9.92

Source of Variance		MS	DF	F	P*
Dimension:	Org.	3.00	1	0.03	0.863
	Prof.	260.00	1	2.73	0.099
	Pub. Ser.	0.00	1	0.00	1.000
	Self-Reg.	21.00	1	0.21	0.649
	Aut.	62.00	1	0.63	0.428

* These means do not differ significantly at the .05 level

that there are no significant differences between the mean attitude scores obtained for these particular groups on any of the five dimensions of professionalism examined. Essentially, these two groups of teachers display similar feelings on each of the attitudes of professionalism. Interpreted in another way, the degree of professionalism expressed by members of both groups did not differ (at the statistically significant level selected) on any dimension of professionalism considered.

DERIVATION OF GROUPS BASED ON COMBINATIONS OF CHARACTERISTICS

Several attempts were made to secure from the study sample high and low prestige teacher groupings of sufficient size which possessed the required combination of positional, professional and personal characteristics. Two sets of groups were identified. In the first set, the high prestige group is comprised of teachers engaged at the secondary level (7-12) who possess a Bachelor of Education degree or more and between six and 20 years of teaching experience; the low prestige group includes teachers engaged at the elementary level (1-6) who have no degree and less than six or more than 20 years of teaching experience. For the second set, the high prestige group are administrators possessing more than a Bachelor of Education degree and between six and 20 years of teaching experience; the responding low prestige group contains full-time teachers with a Bachelor of Education degree or less and less than six or more than 20 years of teaching experience.

The teacher groups comprising the two sets described above were the only ones generated by a comprehensive search of the study sample. This search was designed to identify and select respondents who possessed as many of the characteristics as possible that obtained either the highest or lowest prestige ratings from teachers in general.

FINDINGS: ATTITUDINAL DIFFERENCES BASED ON COMBINATIONS OF CHARACTERISTICS

Hypothesis 5.4: The attitudes of high and low prestige teacher groups classified on the basis of a combination of positional, professional and personal characteristics differ significantly on the dimensions of professionalism.

This sub-section reports results of the analysis carried out to test Hypothesis 5.4.

Data presented in Table 50 for set one show that the attitude of the high prestige grouping differs significantly from the attitude of the low prestige grouping on the Autonomy dimension of professionalism. Elementary teachers with no degree and less than six or more than 20 years of experience rated the desire to make independent decisions about their work higher than members of the low prestige group. The attitudes expressed by the low prestige group proved to be more positive in regard to the autonomy issues examined. Attitudes of these two prestige groupings do not differ significantly (at the .05 level) on any of the other four professionalism dimensions considered. However, mean attitude scores of the high prestige group exceeded those of the low prestige group for the Organization, Public Service and Self-Regulation dimensions but not to a degree which would indicate significance at the .05 level.

Mean attitude estimates and the results of the analysis of these data for the second set of groups, that is the two prestige groupings of teachers based on the selected positional and professional characteristics, are reported in Table 51. Data reveal that the attitudes of the high and

Table 50

Mean Attitude Score (MAS), Standard Deviation (SD), Results of One-way ANOVA and Newman-Keuls Comparison of Ordered Means by Dimension of Professionalism for High and Low Prestige Groups Classified According to the Professional Characteristics of Teaching Experience, Qualifications and Teaching Level

Prestige Group		MAS (Adjusted) by Dim. of Prof.					SD by Dim. of Prof.				
		Org.	Prof.	Pub. Ser.	Self-Reg.	Aut.	Org.	Prof.	Pub. Ser.	Self-Reg.	Aut.
A. Set 1** N = 155	- Hi	51.19	49.16	51.04	50.45	49.19	11.40	9.70	11.17	10.02	9.57
B. Set 1** N = 75	- Lo	50.00	50.43	49.46	49.61	52.34	8.38	7.26	9.33	8.23	9.96
	Total	50.80	49.58	50.52	50.18	50.22	10.48	8.96	10.59	9.45	9.90

Source of Variance		MS	DF	F	P
Dimension:	Org.	72.25	1	0.65	0.420
	Prof.	81.75	1	1.01	0.315
	Pub. Ser.	126.06	1	1.12	0.291
	Self-Reg.	35.50	1	0.39	0.530
	Aut.	501.75	1	5.19	0.024

** Indicates groups based on teaching experience, qualifications and teaching level

Table 50 (continued)

N-K Comparisons			A	B
Dimension:		MAS (Adjusted)	49.19	52.34
Autonomy	A.	49.19	0.00	3.15*
	B.	52.34		0.00

* These means differ significantly at the .05 level or beyond

** Indicates groups based on teaching experience, qualifications and teaching level

Table 51

Mean Attitude Score (MAS), Standard Deviation (SD), Results of One-way ANOVA and Newman-Keuls Comparison of Ordered Means by Dimension of Professionalism for High and Low Prestige Groups Classified According to the Positional and Professional Characteristics of Teaching Position, Experience and Qualifications

Prestige Group		MAS (Adjusted) by Dim. of Prof.					SD by Dim. of Prof.				
		Org.	Prof.	Pub. Ser.	Self-Reg.	Aut.	Org.	Prof.	Pub. Ser.	Self-Reg.	Aut.
A. Set 2** N = 74	- Hi	50.32	48.31	49.34	49.01	50.97	11.38	8.85	9.12	9.02	10.54
B. Set 2** N = 93	- Lo	50.69	50.91	49.92	50.65	52.21	8.67	7.59	10.00	9.33	9.95
	Total	50.53	49.75	49.66	49.92	51.66	9.90	8.22	9.57	9.14	10.17

Source of Variance		MS	DF	F	P
Dimension:	Org.	5.87	1	0.06	0.808
	Prof.	278.75	1	4.17	0.043
	Pub. Ser.	13.56	1	0.15	0.702
	Self-Reg.	111.37	1	1.33	0.251
	Aut.	63.88	1	0.61	0.435

** Indicates groups based on teaching position, experience and qualifications

Table 51 (continued)

N-K Comparisons			A	B
Dimension:		MAS (Adjusted)	48.31	50.91
Profession	A.	48.31	0.00	2.60*
	B.	50.91		0.00

* These means differ significantly at the .05 level or beyond

** Indicates groups based on teaching position, experience and qualifications low prestige groups described differ significantly on the Profession dimension. In this instance, feelings expressed by the group of full-time teachers who possess a degree or less and experience in the less than six or over 20 year ranges are more positive in nature than are those of the high prestige group consisting of administrators who possess more than a Bachelor of Education degree and between six and 20 years of teaching experience. Belief in the value of the professional organization as a beneficial structure is more pronounced for the low prestige teacher group. The same group rated each of the five professionalism characteristics higher than did their high prestige counterparts.

THE STATUS CONGRUENCY-INCONGRUENCY CLASSIFICATION MODEL

Status congruent and status incongruent groups were determined on the basis of the factors specified in the model detailed in Figure 2.

According to the classification model (Figure 2) the status of a teacher is classified as congruent if he is a practicing administrator with between six and 20 years of teaching experience and at least a Bachelor of Education degree (High-High Status) or, if he is a teacher with less than six or more than 20 years of teaching experience and no degree (Low-Low status). The condition of status incongruence prevails for teachers who possess High-Low or Low-High combinations of the positional and professional characteristics identified as components of the model.

The sample failed to produce a sufficiently large number of cases for one of the four cells specified in the classification model. A sufficiently large group of non-administrators possessing "high" qualifications and "high" teaching experience could not be obtained.

	Professional Status Factors	
Positional Status Factors	High Status	Low Status
High Status (Administrative Duties)	Status Congruent (Hi-Hi) 1. B.Ed. or more and 2. 6-20 Yr. Teaching Experience 3. Admin. duties	Status Incongruent (Hi-Lo) 1. Less than B.Ed. and 2. Less than 6 or more than 20 Yr. Teaching Experience 3. Admin. duties
Low Status (Teaching - No Administrative Duties)	Status Incongruent (Lo-Hi) 1. B.Ed. or more and 2. 6-20 Yr. Teaching Experience 3. Teaching	Status Congruent (Lo-Lo) 1. Less than B.Ed. 2. Less than 6 or more than 20 Yr. Teaching Experience 3. Teaching

Figure 2

Factors in the Status Congruent-Incongruent Classification Model

FINDINGS: ATTITUDINAL DIFFERENCES BASED ON STATUS CONGRUENCY-INCONGRUENCY

Hypothesis 6: The attitudes of status congruent and status incongruent teacher groupings classified on the basis of selected positional and professional factors differ significantly on the dimensions of professionalism.

The data presented in Table 52 show that the attitudes of the status congruent and status incongruent teacher groups differ significantly with respect to professional autonomy. Teachers experiencing status congruence (practitioners possessing the combination of higher position,

Table 52

Mean Attitude Score (MAS), Standard Deviation (SD), Results of One-way ANOVA and Newman-Keuls Comparison of Ordered Means by Dimension of Professionalism for Status Congruent and Status Incongruent Groups Classified on the Basis of Positional and Professional Factors

Status Group		MAS (Adjusted) by Dim. of Prof.					SD by Dim. of Prof.				
		Org.	Prof.	Pub. Ser.	Self-Reg.	Aut.	Org.	Prof.	Pub. Ser.	Self-Reg.	Aut.
A. Congruent N = 74	(Hi-Hi)[a]	50.32	48.31	49.34	49.01	50.97	11.38	8.85	9.12	9.33	10.54
B. Incongruent N = 176	(Hi-Lo)	50.09	49.98	51.69	49.72	47.92	10.53	10.87	11.25	10.23	9.28
C. Congruent N = 93	(Lo-Lo)	50.69	50.91	49.92	50.65	52.21	8.67	7.59	10.00	9.02	9.95
	Total	50.30	49.87	50.70	49.82	49.74	10.22	9.65	10.49	9.70	9.89

Source of Variance		MS	DF	F	P
Dimension:	Org.	11.16	2	0.11	0.900
	Prof.	141.78	2	1.52	0.220
	Pub. Ser.	182.84	2	1.66	0.191
	Self-Reg.	57.59	2	0.61	0.545
	Aut.	631.72	2	6.66	0.001

[a] See Figure 2 for descriptive characteristics

Table 52 (continued)

N-K Comparisons			B	A	C
Dimension:		MAS (Adjusted)	47.92	50.97	52.21
Autonomy	B.	47.92	0.00	3.05*	4.29*
	A.	50.97		0.00	1.24
	C.	52.21			0.00

* These means differ significantly at the .05 level or beyond

[a] See Figure 2 for descriptive characteristics

qualifications and experience) hold more positive attitudes concerning the Autonomy dimension than do teachers experiencing status incongruence. Members of the status incongruent group do not feel as strongly as the other two groups about the desirability of controlling the right to make decisions in connection with their professional work. Related findings suggest that status congruency is not an important determinant of attitudinal differences which are significant (at the .05 level) for professionalism attributes measured by the Organization, Profession, Public Service and Self-Regulation dimensions.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The findings presented in this chapter confirm that there are no significant differences between the attitudes of professionalism for high and low status groups classified according to the positional characteristics specified. Consequently, the null hypothesis is accepted and the statistical hypothesis stated in hypothesis 5.1 is rejected. For high and low status groups classified according to the positional, professional and personal characteristics specified there are instances where attitudinal differences associated with the attributes of professionalism investigated are significant at the selected probability level of .05. Since the related null hypotheses have been proven false, the statistical hypotheses are tentatively accepted, but not without strong reservation. The decision to accept hypotheses 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4 with reservation carries no implication that all, or even the majority, of differences investigated are significantly different. Actually, evidence resulting from the various analyses indicate more agreement than difference between and among group beliefs concerning professionalism. It is noted that 15 of the 75 comparisons made revealed differences in attitudes of professionalism which are significant. The findings also show that the attitudes of high and low prestige groups classified according to place of professional preparation are not significantly different (at the .05 level) for any of the five dimensions of professionalism considered. With one exception all high and low prestige groupings hold essentially the same feelings about professional autonomy. In the majority of cases where attitudes between prestige groups are significantly different the aspects of professionalism involved concern the professional organization (the dimensions of Organization and Profession).

The findings revealed some noteworthy trends. Teachers with less than six and more than 20 years of teaching experience, a low prestige group, possess attitudes which are more profession oriented than do teachers with 11 to 20 years experience in respect to the ATA and Belief in the Public Service ideal. Secondary teachers, a high prestige group, are more profession oriented than are Elementary teachers when their professional organization (the ATA) and endorsement of the notion of colleagues control are evaluated. An unanticipated finding confirmed that teachers who had not held any official ATA office at anytime possessed a more supportive attitude toward the Association than teachers with experience in an ATA office. However, the attitude of the latter group is more favourable toward the profession as a valuable organizational identity (the Organization dimension). These phenomena are difficult to explain unless one speculates that office holders and moderately experienced teachers hold much higher expectations for their organization than do their other teacher colleagues.

Elementary teachers may not be as supportive of the ATA as Secondary teachers due to their lack of direct involvement in Association affairs. Younger teachers, those between 25 and 50 years of age, expressed attitudes which differed significantly from those of older teachers (over 60) on the Organization and Profession dimensions. This seems understandable if it is reasoned that the upward mobile group recognizes the benefits to be derived from supporting the professional organization's drive toward increased status for teachers. Members of the older group may not be as interested in achieving higher status through the medium of the "profession" since the benefit to be derived is, comparatively, "short term" rather than "long term" in nature.

Prestige groupings derived from the specified combinations of professional and positional-professional characteristics hold attitudes which differ significantly (at the .05 level) on the profession as a major referent and on professional autonomy. In both instances the low prestige group achieved the higher mean attitude score. Teachers belonging to low prestige groups may be aware of their relatively unfavourable status. Consequently, it seems reasonable to assume that their attitudes might reflect a stronger desire to support any organizational structure designed to increase their relative status. Likely, they do not possess the same degree of professional autonomy as that which is accorded to high prestige colleagues by the school system. This may be one of the reasons explaining why they attach greater importance to this particular privilege than do teachers who exercise more freedom in making decisions about their work.

The findings indicate that there is a total of 15 instances where high and low prestige group attitudes about professionalism differ at the .05 probability level. Both prestige groups share the "higher scores" description in close to an equal number of cases. There is no indication that either of these two groupings consistently holds the more positive belief on any one of the five dimensions of professionalism investigated. High and low prestige groups classified according to professional characteristics constitute the majority of cases where attitudes differ at or beyond the critical level of .05.

The purpose of presenting the data displayed in Table 53 is to show results obtained from comparing rating tendencies of high prestige groups on the five dimensions of professionalism with those of the low prestige groups. When the size of the mean attitude scores for these two teacher classifications are compared for each attribute of professionalism examined, it is apparent that low prestige groupings tended to rate items measuring the Organization, Profession and Autonomy dimensions higher on the attitude scales used. Generally, the scores of high prestige groupings on items associated with belief in the Public Service and Self-Regulation dimensions exceeded those of low prestige groupings. One additional trend is apparent from examining the relative size of attitude measures presented in Table 53. There is a noticeable absence of situations where mean scores for either of the two prestige groups compared are relatively larger or smaller for all five dimensions of professionalism. The one exception reveals that full-time teachers who possess a degree or less, and less than six or more than 20 years of teaching experience awarded the higher rating to each of the five attributes of professionalism.

Relevant findings confirm that the attitudes of status congruent and status incongruent groups differ significantly on matters associated

Table 53

Comparisons According to Relative Size of Mean Attitude Scores of High and Low Prestige Groups by Dimension of Professionalism for Selected Positional, Professional and Personal Characteristics

		Relative Size of Paired Mean Scores by Dimension of Prof.				
Prestige Groups by Characteristic (High Prestige - Hi, Low Prestige - Lo)		Org.	Prof.	Pub. Ser.	Self-Reg.	Aut.
Groups: Positional Char.						
Administrators	- Hi	S**	S	L	(L	L
Supervisory - Leadership	- Lo	L*	L	S	S)	S
Basic Instructional	- Hi	S	L	S	(L	L
Vocational-Technical	- Lo	L	S	L	S)	S
Groups: Professional Char.						
Teaching Exp. (11-20 Yr.)	- Hi	(S)	(L)	(S)	S	L
Teaching Exp. (Over 20 Yr.)	- Lo	(L)	(S)	(L)	L	S
Teaching Qual. (6 or more Yr.)	- Hi	S	(S)	L	L	S
Teaching Qual. (Less than 4 Yr.)	- Lo	L	(L)	S	S	L
Teaching Level (Sr. High)	- Hi	(L)	S	L	(L)	S
Teaching Level (Div.II: 4-6)	- Lo	(S)	L	S	(S)	L
ATA Office Held (Yes)	- Hi	(S)	(L)	S	L	L
ATA Office Held (No)	- Lo	(L)	(S)	L	S	S
Groups: Personal Char.						
Age (25-50 Yr.)	- Hi	(L)	(L)	L	S	S
Age (Over 60 Yr.)	- Lo	(S)	(S)	S	L	L
Sex (Male)	- Hi	S	(S)	(L)	L	S
Sex (Female)	- Lo	L	(L)	(S)	S	L
Prof. Prep. (Alberta)	- Hi	S	L	L	S	S
Prof. Prep. (Outside Canada)	- Lo	L	S	S	L	L
Groups: Combinations of Char.						
Teaching Exp., Qual., and Level	- Hi	L	S	L	L	(S)
Teaching Exp., Qual., and Level	- Lo	S	L	S	S	(L)
Teaching Position, Exp. and Qual.	- Hi	S	(S)	S	S	S
Teaching Position, Exp. and Qual.	- Lo	L	(L)	L	L	L

* Indicates the mean score with the larger value in the comparison

** Indicates the mean score with the smaller value in the comparison

() Indicates the pairs of means which differ significantly at the .05 level or beyond with professional autonomy. The presence of significant differences between status congruent and incongruent groups will not permit acceptance of the null hypothesis tested. However, acceptance of the statistical hypothesis (hypothesis 6) is unwarranted in this instance unless the decision to accept is made conditionally. It must be noted that the Autonomy dimension is the only one of the five examined which produced statistically significant differences (.05 level) among the status groups involved. Why Alberta teachers who experience status incongruency do not feel more strongly on some aspects of professionalism than colleagues who experience status congruency is difficult to explain. It may be that members of the former group are too preoccupied in efforts to remove causes for unfavourable imbalances in relative status to be overly concerned with standards of professionalism.

SUMMARY

The findings reported in this chapter clearly indicate that the attitudes of professionalism held by high and low prestige groups classified according to positional characteristics do not differ significantly. Attitudinal differences between high and low prestige groupings classified according to professional and personal characteristics and combinations of these are significant at the .05 probability level in about one-quarter of the situations examined. There is no general tendency for the mean attitude score values of one prestige grouping to be consistently larger or smaller for all five dimensions of professionalism. However, high prestige groups do, by a slight margin, tend to rate items included in the Organization, Profession and Autonomy dimensions higher than do low prestige groups. The attitudes of teachers experiencing status congruence differ significantly from the attitudes of teachers experiencing status incongruency on only the Autonomy dimension of professionalism.

CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The content of this chapter includes a summary of each preceding chapter, a set of conclusions formulated on the basis of the findings reported and the relevant implications which appear tc have practical application for education and the teaching profession.

SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

The Problem

This study was designed to inquire into the nature of prestige and attitude differentials existing within the teaching profession in Alberta. The perceptions of teachers in general and prominent subgroupings of the sample were essential to obtaining the prestige and attitude measures required. The investigation was concerned with identifying and describing prestige hierarchies in the teaching profession on the basis of a selected number of factors usually associated with the concept of prestige. An ordering of these selected positional, professional and personal factors according to their perceived relative prestige among teachers was also a primary objective. Determining the relative importance of attitudinal differences between and among various teacher groupings on four of the universally accepted dimensions of professionalism was another major objective. By studying the teaching occupation from an intra-occupational perspective which recognized the segmentation and diversity characterizing a single profession, it was anticipated that the significance of the prestige component as a determinant of stratification in teaching could be more effectively examined.

The Conceptual Framework

A review of the literature and research concerned with the professions, occupational prestige, the status of teachers and factors influencing attitudes provided the conceptual framework for the study. Several theoretical and methodological views advanced by recognized authorities in these fields figured prominently in the design of the framework.

Several complexities, inadequacies and conflicting positions are still apparent in the area of endeavour associated with the analysis of profession and the measurement of prestige, status and attitude. Despite these difficulties, a considerable degree of consensus seems to exist among researchers on such fundamental matters as the nature of a profession and the importance of prestige in ordering our society. The theoretical relevance of the "process model" proposed by Bucher and Strauss (1961) to the objectives of the present study was recognized and stressed. This change-oriented approach emphasizes the need to recognize and take into account the multitude of divisive features and forces which characterize a single occupational category like teaching. Although it was stated by Counts (1925) and several of his contemporaries that teaching cannot be considered a unitary occupation, most studies of prestige and status which involve teachers have demonstrated a persistent tendency to treat it as such. Except for a few quite recent empirical studies dealing with intra-occupational prestige, the subject has received relatively little attention when compared to inter-occupational counterparts. The bases of stratification both across and within occupations is unclear. Conflicting positions advanced by Davis and Moore (1962), Tumin (1967) and others on social stratification serve only to illustrate the magnitude of the gap which still exists in our understanding about this phenomenon. Much less empirical knowledge exists about the nature of the prestige hierarchies which presently exist within teaching. However, the literature on inter-occupational and intra-occupational stratification suggests that there are many factors or criteria involved in the stratification process and for a particular occupational category such as teaching some achieve greater importance than others. Knowledge about the nature and intensity of attitudinal differences regarding professionalism, between and among pertinent status groupings of teachers, is essential if unification of their professionalization effort is to be achieved.

Hypotheses

Twelve hypotheses were formulated to investigate the six sub-problems that emerged from the major problem stated for the study. Sub-problems 1, 2 and 3 were structured to inquire into the nature of teacher perceived prestige hierarchies presently existing in the teaching profession according to a number of selected positional, professional and personal characteristics. Hypotheses 1.1, 2.1 and 3.1 predicted that differences in the amounts of prestige attributed to the categories associated with each of the positional, professional and personal characteristics by teachers in general would be statistically significant. Hypotheses 1.2, 2.2 and 3.2 made the same predictions for differences resulting from the prestige estimates provided by specified sub-groupings of teachers on the same sets of categories. The fourth sub-problem was concerned with the relative importance among teachers of the seven prestige characteristics involved in the investigation. Accordingly, hypothesis 4 proposed that differences in the importance attributed to each of the characteristics evaluated by teachers would be large enough to be statistically significant. The question posed by the fifth sub-problem dealt with the nature of relationships between and among high and low prestige teacher groups regarding their attitudes toward professionalism. Hypotheses 5.1, 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4 were formulated to test predictions which indicated that the attitudes of teacher subgroups classified according to specified positional, professional and personal characteristics, and according to combinations of these characteristics would differ significantly. The sixth sub-problem was concerned with the nature of attitudinal differences among teacher groups experiencing status congruence and status incongruence. It was hypothesized that the attitudes of these particular teacher groupings would differ significantly on the five dimensions of professionalism examined.

Instrumentation

A specially designed opinion inventory (see Appendix A) was used to obtain from teachers, measures of perceived prestige and feelings about selected criteria associated with stratification and professionalism. Part A provided the personal-educational data required for classifications of the respondents. The first section of Part B consisted of the Positional Characteristics Prestige Rating Scale. The second section contained a related series of eight Professional and Personal Characteristics Rating Scales. Two attitude inventories, the Teacher Attitude Inventory and the Attitude/Behaviour Inventory were included as Parts C and D respectively.

Each prestige rating instrument used a six position equal appearing interval-type rating scale to obtain prestige estimates from the respondent regarding each item of each characteristic specified. Summated rating Likert-type scales were incorporated into both Attitude Inventories. The Teacher Attitude Inventory was comprised of ten items structured to enable the practitioner's degree of support for his own professional organization (ATA) to be measured. The Attitude/Behaviour Inventory was a revised version of the original Professional Inventory prepared by Hall (1967) to obtain indices of professionalism on five selected theoretical dimensions of professionalism. Revisions to the original instrument (deletions of items only) were made on the basis of an empirical assessment of Hall's scale which was carried out by Snizek (1972). The final form of the Attitude/Behaviour Inventory consisted of five of ten original scale items for each of four dimensions of professionalism selected by Hall. One dimension of the original inventory was not included in the study version.

Pilot Study

One hundred and eight teachers from four schools belonging to three different jurisdictions and representative of all grade levels participated in a pilot study which provided the data for item selection and refinement, instrument validity checks, and revisions to directions and format. Several changes in item wording, format and directions were made to the Prestige Characteristics Rating Instruments. The discriminatory power of the measurement scales used in these instruments was satisfactorily demonstrated. To obtain measures of prestige which would reveal the relative prestige of the seven professional-personal characteristics involved, the Professional-Personal Characteristics Rating Scale was expanded to include a section for this purpose. Selection of items for the Teacher Attitude Inventory was based on the results obtained from subjecting the appropriate pilot study data to a factor analytic technique. Pertinent data obtained for this study were analyzed in the same manner to further establish the factorial validity of items selected for both attitude instruments. Correlational analysis methods were also used to examine both sets of data in an attempt to provide further evidence of the validity and reliability of each instrument.

Data Collection

The source of data for the study was a random sample of 1069 practicing teachers drawn from the most current membership lists of The Alberta Teachers' Association. During the months of November and December, 1972 a total of 712 completed questionnaires were received from respondents. This return represented a 66.6 percent response rate.

Statistical Treatment

To facilitate statistical treatment of data obtained from the respondents these data were transferred to computer cards. Appropriate scoring procedures were followed prior to computing mean prestige and attitude scores required for analysis of the data. The standard deviation statistic was computed, reported and interpreted for each mean score involved. Since all the hypotheses proposed for the study required the use of statistical procedures which would determine whether statistically significant differences existed either among or between sets of mean scores, and since interval scales were assumed, parametric statistical procedures were followed. In the one instance where ordinal variables entered into the analysis the Spearman rank-order correlation was followed. The parametric statistical procedures followed included the one and two-way analysis of variance methods, product-moment correlation and the tests commonly associated with these: F-test, t-test and Newman-Keuls multiple comparison procedure. The .05 level of confidence was selected for rejection of the null hypothesis in all cases. To determine validity and reliability measures for the attitude inventories used, the Principal Components Method of Factor Analysis was applied to relevant study data.

Results of Statistical Analysis

Positional Characteristics. Hypotheses 1.1 and 1.2 predicted the statistical significance of differences in the amounts of prestige attributed to positional characteristics by teachers in general and by specified major groupings of the sample. The findings supported both of these hypotheses and provided evidence of the precise nature of the positional prestige hierarchy as perceived by teachers in general and the five major groupings of teachers involved. According to the responses of the sample, the 19 school positions considered are categorized into four major prestige levels or clusters with principals' positions occupying the highest level in the hierarchy. Positions comprising each of the other three levels constitute a cluster or family due to the nature of their relationship to one another. Unlike the cluster of principals' positions, the positions belonging to each of the other clusters do not differ significantly from one another in the amount of prestige they command from colleagues. Since five of the six principals' positions do differ in this respect, this particular cluster constitutes a sub-hierarchy of the overall positional prestige hierarchy. No significant differences exist among the five major positional groupings with respect to the way in which members of these groups ranked the 19

BELL-FAST BOND

positional subgroups, but the mean prestige scores of these same groups do differ significantly among themselves. In addition, the presence of significant differences among the mean prestige scores of constituent subgroups comprising each major group was established. The tendency for teachers to consistently estimate more highly than others the relative prestige of their own positions was apparent in the findings.

Professional and Personal Characteristics. Hypotheses 2.1, 2.2, 3.1 and 3.2 predicted that the amounts of prestige attributed by teachers, in general, and selected teacher subgroups, to categories associated with each of the professional and personal characteristics would differ significantly. All of these hypotheses were supported and accepted. The findings established that teachers are accorded differential prestige by other teachers when they evaluate particular professional and personal characteristics of their colleagues. The same tendency discovered for positional characteristics exists for professional and personal characteristics: teacher groupings exhibited a strong tendency to estimate highly in comparison to others the relative prestige of those characteristics which they possessed. Distinctive prestige hierarchies exist for each of the professional and personal characteristics investigated. The nature of these structures is detailed in Tables 29 and 31. In general, teacher subgroups classified according to professional characteristics possessed tended to agree with total sample prestige estimates more often than subgroups classified according to personal characteristics possessed. This was most evident in the case of ratings obtained for teaching qualifications and official ATA office held. In most of the cases examined, statistical evidence established that the selected subgroups did not differ from one another with respect to how they used the prestige rating scales to evaluate the categories considered. In every case examined, statistical evidence indicated the presence of significant differences among subgroups with respect to prestige scores attributed to each of the subgroups evaluated, and also with respect to the tendency among subgroups to maintain similar rating patterns for each of the characteristics. Teachers as a group indicated that the most prestigious teacher grouping is Senior High School teachers who possess between 11 and 20 years teaching experience, six or more years of university preparation and a record of service in an official ATA office. The personal qualities of this high prestige group indicates members to be males between the ages of 25 and 50 who have been prepared in Alberta universities. The low prestige category includes Division Two female teachers over 60 years of age who have been prepared outside of Canada, and who have less than three years of teaching experience, similar qualifications and no service in an ATA office.

Hypothesis 4 stated that there are significant differences in the importance teachers in general attribute to the seven professional and personal characteristics evaluated. The findings supported this prediction. Teachers in general regard teaching experience as the most important characteristic, and sex of teacher and ATA office held (both have equal prestige) as the least important characteristics.

Attitudes of Professionalism

The five hypotheses developed for investigating sub-problems 5(a), 5(b), 5(c), 5(d) and 6 predicted that attitudinal differences of the various high and low prestige teacher groups involved in the assessment of the five dimensions of professionalism would be statistically significant. Since the attitudes of high and low positional prestige groups do not differ significantly on any of the dimensions of professionalism examined, hypothesis 5.1 was rejected. Hypothesis 5.2 and 5.3 were supported in part. There are instances where the attitudes of high and low prestige teacher groupings, classified according to one of the professional or personal characteristics, do differ significantly on one or more of the dimensions of professionalism. It was also discovered that the attitudes of teachers experiencing status congruence differ significantly from those of teachers experiencing status incongruence on only one of the five dimensions of professionalism -- Autonomy. Status congruent teachers hold the more positive attitude on this matter. The findings indicate that, in general, the feelings of teachers belonging to high and low prestige classifications are similar on professionalism issues much more often than otherwise. Except for one instance, there is no tendency for either of the two prestige classifications to be consistently more or less positive regarding the five beliefs examined. The exception is non-administrators with minimal experience and qualifications. Members of this low prestige group tended to be more positive than their counterparts on all five attitudes of professionalism. Prestige and status congruency do not appear to be highly influential determinants of practitioner attitude toward professionalism.

CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions presented here are offered as a set of judgments which appeared to have some practical application for persons either interested in or identified with the teaching profession. The inferences made are based on evidence provided by the study, consideration of the limitations imposed by theoretical and methodological assumptions involved, scope of the study and complexities characterizing the particular research area. Strictly speaking, the conclusions are only valid for the population sampled, but they should be of interest and value to similar professional organizations and their administrative personnel.

1. Teaching cannot be considered a unitary occupational category. Substantial evidence was produced by the investigation to indicate that the perceptions of prestige among teachers differ significantly regarding the relative importance of their professional functions as well as the professional and personal qualities required to perform them.
2. Prestige is an important and precise determinant of statuses existing within the teaching profession. The nature of the differences between and among the prestige measures examined, identified some features of the stratification in teaching and revealed their relative importance.
3. Distinctive, firmly established prestige hierarchies exist within the Alberta teaching force. The findings give strong support to the conclusion that teachers attribute different prestige to their colleagues according to the nature of the position held in school and the particular combination of professional and personal characteristics possessed. Principals are undoubtedly recognized as the highest prestige positional group while Counsellors and Physical Education teachers share the least prestigious placement. Evidence established that a four level, situs-type positional prestige hierarchy presently exists in

teaching. From the analysis it can be concluded that teaching experience and place of professional preparation are the most important professional and personal characteristics, and that service in an official ATA office and sex of teacher are the least important characteristics in these categories. It can also be concluded that a high degree of agreement exists among teachers, in general, about the relative importance of the classifications of each professional and personal characteristic. In this regard, the reverse is true for most cases involving the perceptions of selected subgroups.

4. As individuals, teachers tend to rate highly compared to others the relative prestige of the particular positional, professional and personal characteristics which they possess. Analyses confirmed that this was a phenomenon of teachers for each of the characteristics considered and also that this conclusion is somewhat contrary to related findings presented by Grambs (1949: 400-405).
5. The attitudes of high prestige and low prestige teachers based on positional classifications do not differ on the basic dimensions of professionalism. Statistical evidence established that these prestige groupings expressed essentially the same feelings about the concepts of professionalism examined.
6. Prestige differentials do not constitute a highly influential factor with respect to the attitudes of professionalism held by teachers. The findings presented in the study indicate that the attitudes of professionalism held by members of the high and low prestige classifications established for each of the professional

and personal characteristics involved do differ significantly, but only in a small minority of cases. It is also apparent from evidence that in those cases where significant attitudinal differences do exist, there is a lack of consistency between prestige groups regarding the perceived importance of the attitudes of professionalism evaluated. The same situation prevails for the high and low prestige groupings based on combinations of professional and personal characteristics.

7. Teachers who have not served in an official ATA office are more supportive of the ATA policies and practices examined than those who have had this experience. The analysis established that the attitudes of the predominantly larger group of non-office holders were more favourable toward their own professional organization than the attitudes of office holders. However, the situation is reversed for these two groups when the profession as a major referent was considered.
8. The attitudes of status congruent teachers are more positive in nature than those of status incongruent teachers regarding feelings associated with professional autonomy. According to the results of the study, teachers experiencing status congruence value the right to make decisions about their work more highly than the group of colleagues who belong to the status incongruent classification.
9. The responses of teachers classified according to the factors specified in Figure 2 indicate that status congruency-incongruency is not a highly important determinant of significant attitudinal difference with respect to most of the attitudes of professionalism

considered. Comparisons among groups involving measures of attitude on four of the five dimensions of professionalism investigated revealed that the nature of these attitudinal differences are not statistically significant.

IMPLICATIONS

There are no doubt numerous implications which could be proposed as a result of the findings and conclusions produced by the study. Those which seem to have practical application for education, educators, trustees, administrators and the professional organization involved are presented.

General Implications

Underlying reasons for the existence within the Alberta teaching force of the prestige hierarchies described in the study are not discernible from the evidence that was presented. However, it may be speculated that the presence of various prestige differentials which do not conform to popular expectations are due in some measure to rather extreme changes in the nature of the teaching force and the valuing systems of its members.

Knowledge about the precise nature of the basic prestige hierarchies, prestige groupings and attitudes of professionalism held by members belonging to these categories could provide a useful basis for increasing the effectiveness of the decision-making process in education. The positional, professional and personal characteristics which command the greatest amounts of prestige from teachers will likely influence their opinions about teacher placement and selections for promotion in the system. If decisions in this regard are based on criteria which reflect the values perceived by teachers in general, negative reactions to these decisions are likely to be less numerous and less intense. However, decisions which appear to be gross violations of prestige values held by teachers are quite likely to provoke criticism, resentment and even open opposition of considerable magnitude. The implications of such situations for education at the local level are in large measure dependent on the kind of response teacher concerns and protests draw from the affected system's administrative personnel. If attempts are made to centralize further the control of work related activities and thus reduce the professional autonomy of teachers, the effective and harmonious operation of the school could be seriously jeopardized. On the other hand, if teacher involvement in the decision-making process is recognized and promoted through action and policy designed to share the role of making decisions about matters which affect them and their clients, the quality of professional service provided in the schools could be enhanced further. The overriding assumption made proposes that measures taken to increase rather than decrease professional autonomy are more likely to produce desirable changes for the educational enterprise.

Certain findings presented in the study may be interpreted by some as being strongly supportive of the position which is based on the proposition that teaching and school administration are separate professions. This posture would have to disregard evidence revealing the number of important similarities that were found between the perceptions of teachers and school administrators. Consequently, it is quite apparent that results of the study provide about as much support for one side of this argument as they do for the other.

Prestige accorded to teachers by other teacher colleagues may have important consequences for the teaching-learning process. These perceived measures of one's social worth are also indicative of one's psychological and social needs. Since teachers and administrators have different needs which vary according to age, sex, professional role and the like, an approach to individualizing the process by which teachers' needs are satisfied seems essential. In response to this problem Trusty and Sergiovanni (1971:438-449) propose the creation of a separate hierarchy for teachers based on a restructuring of their roles to involve them in allocating organizational resources. It seems reasonable to anticipate that as teachers developed maturity in this new role and achieved a wider variety of role-competencies within a teaching hierarchy, administrators, board members, and citizens would recognize and reward their contributions accordingly.

Reference to the prestige hierarchies which presently exist in teaching provides sufficient evidence for administrators, trustees, teachers and their own professional organization to identify critical needs (often some form of recognition) of particular prestige groupings. Often, such needs are of an inservice or developmental nature. If genuine interest exists within the profession for meeting the continuing education needs of teachers, then it seems that a fundamental principle to observe in doing so would be to plan offerings which are tailored to the needs of the different prestige groups. This approach to increasing teacher competency and confidence can have important consequences for the teaching-learning process and the professionalization effort of the profession. Disruptive forces hindering progress in these areas can be removed or effectively neutralized.

Probably the most critical need for many teachers is the need to make their work more satisfying. Research has established that the higher the status of the individual in the occupation, the more satisfied he will be. Many teachers (non-administrators) do not have the same privileges as some of their colleagues regarding professional autonomy. Consequently, there is little or no incentive among those affected to improve the quality of service. It would appear that a concerted effort is required to "humanize" at least that portion of the work performed by teachers which is the most unsatisfying. While it is recognized that many variations exist within teaching, and that the aspects of jobs which teachers like and dislike vary also, the humanization task is not an insurmountable one. Any effective plan to increase teacher satisfaction should be concerned with improving or increasing comfort, challenge, pay and the opportunity for interaction with co-workers. Literature on the subject is replete with ideas and suggestions detailing procedures for making teaching tasks more satisfying and fitting to perform. The solution proposed by Kahn (1973:35-95) offers one promising approach. He recommends the implementation of a work-module concept based on the premise that workers are happier when they can construct the job than they are when the job constructs them.

The fact that many teachers tend to rate consistently more highly than others the relative importance of their own characteristics could be construed as unfortunate. It may be an important factor contributing to the strained relationships which sometimes occur among groups. If individual teachers took a more objective view of colleague opinion in this regard, it may serve to remove problematic misunderstandings about prestige differentials. For example, it is apparent that at least some personal factors such as age and sex are beyond individual control. It must also be recognized that teacher awareness of the existing teacher-perceived prestige hierarchies may lead to the creation of broader differences between certain prestige groupings of teachers. It could also cause significant changes and shifts within the profession.

An interesting question which cannot be answered at this juncture concerns the degree to which the present system of rewards conforms to the prestige value structure perceived by teachers. Extensive differentiation of the present system of rewards may be quite acceptable to teachers if its purpose was to recognize and reward outstanding professional qualities and services rather than to penalize the unfortunates.

The consequences of status incongruence in teaching are dependent on its intensity and the extent to which the phenomenon exists among teachers. Evidence provided by this study on these matters did indicate, but not in extreme form, that such a condition exists within the Alberta teaching force. Previous discussion emphasized the need for establishing effective mechanisms to improve the lower status factors and thus reduce its incidence in teaching. Failure to mount a serious effort to minimize this problem, regardless of its magnitude, is bound to result in unfortunate setbacks for education and educators. Since everyone involved stands to lose, a concerted, cooperative effort is required on the part of researchers, administrators, trustees, teachers and the professional organization. Undoubtedly it will cost more, but most worthwhile improvements usually do.

Implications for Research

The views expressed by Counts and several contemporaries, discounting the unitary nature of the teaching occupation seem to have been well founded according to the findings presented for this study. Evidence revealed that substantial stratification based on perceived prestige of teachers exists within the Alberta teaching force. Consequently, it seems logical to propose that future research concerned with establishing more reliable indicators of the status of teaching among occupations give due consideration to major internal divisions characterizing this profession. A parallel requirement for developing more valid approaches to intra-occupational studies of teaching would seem to be adherence to the philosophy of change held by Bucher and Strauss. Results of analyses which focus on important internal differences caused by change may be much more meaningful than results from efforts that reject this approach. The latter suggestion poses some interesting and pertinent implications for professional associations. These implications are presented under the next heading.

This study was not concerned with securing empirical evidence that would identify and explain causal factors of prestige and attitude differentiation among teachers. Investigations designed to pursue problems in this area would be useful in supplementing and extending the scope of this study.

Implications for Professional Associations (ATA)

The approach to the study of the professions developed by Bucher and Strauss focuses on change but does not advance a theoretical philosophy of change. "Profession" is conceptualized as "a loose amalgamation of segments" constantly undergoing change. Findings presented in this study serve to confirm, further, the appropriateness and utility of the "process model" as an effective analytical approach to the study of the teaching profession. This evidence suggests that the Association should continue and if possible increase the emphasis on aspects of its research program which are directed at obtaining precise knowledge about the nature and needs of the various strata present within the teaching profession.

The view of Bucher and Strauss has interesting implications in the study of socialization of professions and their professional organizations. Because Alberta teachers figured most prominently in this study pertinent implications for The Alberta Teachers' Association are of primary importance. Such implications may also have relevance for teachers' organizations in other parts of Canada and elsewhere.

Although many similarities among prestige groupings exist, it is also apparent from the findings that a considerable degree of segmentation and diversity of attitude are present among Alberta teachers on such matters as the relative status of teaching positions and the attitudes of professional autonomy. Evidence which describes the nature and degree of stratification in teaching, the characteristics of particular internal groupings and their attitudinal differences and similarities on professionalism constitutes a useful knowledge base for planning organizational action to facilitate the professionalization process.

If the professionalization process is to proceed on a unified front and with a measure of internal solidarity, it seems vital that the Association review, periodically, its major policies and practices so that revisions may be made. Such modifications should be based on a responsiveness to the interests, needs and values held by members of known prestige groups which comprise the various prestige hierarchies in teaching.

The underlying implication suggests that if a major objective of the ATA is to effectively stimulate and coordinate the drive toward increased status of teaching, then the profession will likely achieve greater gains by concentrating on unification of the effort through being more responsive to the social and psychological needs of the prominent segments which comprise the association membership.

A further implication follows from the fact that principals were accorded the highest prestige and relative status of all positional teacher groups. This situation suggests that teachers serving in these positions may be called upon too frequently to accept leadership roles in the professional organization. If this is the case, it does not necessarily follow that the interests of all teachers are being adequately represented in the policy making forums of the profession. To correct such an imbalance, teachers belonging to various other prestige groups should be encouraged by the Association to assume equal responsibility for advancement of their profession's objectives.

Implications for Educational Administration

Most of the discussion presented in the three previous sections of this chapter refers to problems, solutions, approaches and developments which directly involve some aspect of educational administration. The overriding implication for this field of endeavour is rooted in the suggestion that it must provide the leadership and expertise required for designing and implementing the educational changes needed. To do so, it must give more attention to examining relevant theory and practice associated with the sociology of occupations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

Bonner, Hubert
1953 Social Psychology. American Book Co., New York.

Caplow, Theodore
1954 The Sociology of Work. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Carr-Saunders, A.M. and P.A. Wilson
1933 The Professions. The Clarendon Press, Oxford.

Centers, Richard
1949 The Psychology of Social Classes: A Study of Class Consciousness. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.

Corwin, Ronald
1965 A Sociology of Education. Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York.

Dubin, Robert
1961 Human Relations in Administration. (2nd ed.), Prentice-Hall, Inc. Englewood-Cliffs, New Jersey.

Ferguson, George A.
1966 Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. Second edition, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., Toronto.

Gezi, Kalil, I. and James E. Meyers
1968 Teaching in American Culture. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., San Francisco.

Gilb, Catherine Lathrop
1966 Hidden Hierarchies: The Professions and Government. Harper and Row, New York.

Glass, G.V. and J.C. Stanley
1970 Statistical Methods in Education and Psychology. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

Gross, Edward
1958 Work and Society. Thomas Y. Crowell, New York.

Hall, Richard H.
1969 Occupations and the Social Structure. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

Homans, George C.
1961 Social Behavior. Harcourt, Brace and World Inc., New York.

Hughes, Everett C.
1958 Men and Their Work. Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois.

Krause, Elliott A.
1971 The Sociology of Occupations. Little, Brown and Co., Boston

Lieberman, Myron
1956 Education as a Profession. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

Moore, Wilbert E.
1970 The Professions: Roles and Rules. Russel Sage Foundation, New York.

Newcomb, Theodore M.
1943 Personality and Social Change: Attitude Formation in a Student Community. Dryden Press, New York.

Pavalko, Ronald M.
1971 Sociology of Professions and Occupations. F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., Itasca, Illinois.

Reiss, Albert J.
1961 Occupations and Social Status. Free Press of Glencoe, New York.

Reissman, Leonard
1959 Class in American Society. The Free Press, New York.

Sherif, Muzafer and Carolyn W. Sherif
1956 An Outline of Social Psychology. Revised edition. Harper and Row, New York.

Slocum, Walter L.
1966 Occupational Careers. Aldine Publishing Co., Chicago.

Stinson, Shirley M.
1970 Deprofessionalization in Nursing? University Microfilms Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Taylor, Lee
1968 Occupational Sociology. Oxford University Press, New York.

Thurstone, L.L.
1959 The Measurement of Values. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Tumin, Melvin
1967 Social Stratification - The Forms and Functions of Inequality. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

Whyte, William H., Jr.
1956 The Organizational Man. Simon and Schuster, New York.

Winer, B.J.
1962 Statistical Principles In Experimental Design. McGraw-Hill Book Co., Toronto.

Zimbardo, Philip and E.G. Ebbsen
1969 Influencing Attitudes and Changing Behavior. Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Don Mills, Ontario.

Zald, Mayer N.
1971 Occupations and Organizations in American Society. Markham Publishing Co., Chicago.

B. PERIODICALS

Anderson, W.A.
1927 "Occupational Attitudes and Choices of a Group of College Men", Social Forces, 4, No. 2, (December).

________.
1934 "The Occupational Attitudes of College Men", Journal of Social Psychology.

Barber, Bernard
1963 "Some Problems in the Sociology of the Professions", Daedalus, Vol. 92.

Benoit-Smullyan, Emile
1944 "Status, Status Types, and Status Interrelations", American Sociological Review, 9, (April).

Bucher, R. and A. Strauss
1961 "Professions in Process", American Journal of Sociology, 66; No. 4 (January).

Cattel, R.B.
1942 "The Concept of Social Status", Journal of Social Psychology, 15, (May).

Counts, George S.
1925 "The Social Status of Occupations: A Problem in Vocational Guidance", School Review, Vol. 33 (January).

Coutu, W.
1936 "The Relative Prestige of Twenty Professions as Judged by Three Groups of Professional Students", Social Forces, 14, (May).

Deeg, M.E. and D.G. Paterson
1947 "Changes in Social Status of Occupations", Occupations, 25 (January).

Foote, Nelson
1953 "The Professionalization of Labor in Detroit", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 58.

Gamson, William A. and Howard Schuman
1963 "Some Under-Currents in the Prestige of Physicians", American Journal of Sociology, 59, (January).

Gertsl, J. and L. Cohen
1964 "Dissensus, Situs and Egocentricism in Occupational Ranking", British Journal of Sociology, 15, (September).

Goode, William J.
1957 "Community within a Community: The Professions", American Sociological Review, 20.

Grambs, Jean D.
1949 "Teachers As a Minority Group", Journal of Educational Sociology, 22.

Greenwood, Ernest
1957 "Attributes of a Profession", Social Work, Vol. 2, No. 3 (July).

Groff, P.J.
1962 "The Social Status of Teachers", Journal of Educational Sociology, 36, No. 1, (September).

Hall, J. and D.C. Jones
1950 "Social Grading of Occupations", British Journal of Sociology, 1, (March).

Hartman, G.A.
1934 "Prestige of Occupations", Personnel Journal, 13, (October).

Hatt, Paul K.
1950 "Occupations and Social Stratification", American Journal of Sociology, 55, (May).

Hodge, Robert W., Paul M. Siegel, and Peter H. Rossi
1964 "Occupational Prestige in The United States, 1925-1963", American Journal of Sociology, 70, (November).

Inkeles, A. and P.H. Rossi
1956 "National Comparisons of Occupational Prestige", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 61.

Kahn, Robert L.
1973 "The Work Module - A Tonic for Lunchpail Lassitude", Psychology To-day, (February).

Kriesberg, Louis
1962 "The Basis of Occupational Prestige: The Case of Dentists", American Sociological Review, Vol. 27, No. 2, (April).

Nam, Charles B. and Mary G. Powers
1968 "Changes in the Relative Status Levels of Workers in the United States, 1950-1960", Social Forces, 47, (December).

Neiz, J.A.
1935 "The Depression and The Social Status of Occupations", Elementary School Journal, 35, (February).

Osgood, C.E., and R. Stagner
1941 "Analysis of a Prestige Frame of Reference by a Gradient Technique", Journal of Applied Psychology, 25, (June).

Saltz, Joanne W.
1960 "Teacher Stereotype - Liability in Recruiting?", School Review, Vol. 68.

Segal, Bernard E.
1962 "Male Nurses: A Case Study in Status Contradiction and Prestige Loss", Social Forces, 41, (October).

Smith, Mapheus
1943 "An Empirical Scale of Prestige Status of Occupations", American Sociological Review, 8, (April).

Snizek, William E.
1972 "Hall's Professionalism Scale: An Empirical Reassessment", American Sociological Review, 37, (February).

Trusty, F.M. and Sergiovanni
1971 "Perceived Need Deficiencies of Teachers and Administrators: A Proposal for Restructuring Teacher Roles", Administering Human Resources, McCutcheon Publishing Corp., Berkley, California.

Tumin, Melvin M.
1953 "Some Principles of Stratification: A Critical Analysis", American Sociological Review, 18, (August).

Ward, S. Mason and Neal Gross
1955 "Intra-Occupational Prestige Differentiation: The School Superintendency", American Sociological Review, 20, (June).

Wilensky, Harold L.
1964 "The Professionalization of Everyone", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 70, No. 2, (September).

C. ARTICLES AND COLLECTIONS

Becker, Howard
1962 "The Nature of a Profession", in Education for the Professions, Sixty-first Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part 2, Nelson B. Henry (ed.), Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bernbaum, G., G. Noble and M.T. Whiteside
1970 "Intra-Occupational Prestige Differentiation in Teaching", Paedogogica Europaea 1969: The European Yearbook of Educational Research: The Changing Role of the Professional Educator. Braunschweig, Westerman; Amsterdam, Elsevier; Edinburgh, W. and R. Chambers; Paris, Hatier.

Blishen, Bernard R.
1964 "The Construction and Use of An Occupation Class Scale", in Canadian Society. (Second edition). Bernard R. Blishen, Frank E. Jones, Kaspar D. Naegele and John Porter (eds.), Macmillan Co. of Canada, Toronto.

________.
1968 "A Socio-Economic Index for Occupations in Canada", in Canadian Society. (Third edition). Bernard R. Blishen, Frank E. Jones, Kaspar D. Naegele and John Porter (eds.), Macmillan Co. of Canada, Toronto.

Charters, W.W.
1963 "The Social Background of Teaching", Handbook of Research on Teaching. N.L. Gage, (ed.), The American Educational Research Association, Rand McNally and Co., Chicago.

Davies, A.F.
1962 "Prestige of Occupations", in Man, Work and Society. Nosow, Sigmund and W.H. Form (eds.), Basic Books Inc., New York.

Davis, Kingsley and Wilbert E. Moore
1962 "The Social Allocation of Occupations: A Functional Analysis" in Man, Work and Society. Nosow, Sigmund and William H. Form (eds.), Basic Books Inc., New York.

Etzioni, Amitai (ed.)
1968 The Semi-Professions and Their Organization. Free Press, New York.

Lortie, Dan C.
1968 "The Balance of Control and Autonomy in Elementary School Teaching", in The Semi-Professions and Their Organization. Amitai Etzioni (ed.), The Free Press, New York.

Malewski, Andrezej
1966 "The Degree of Status Incongruence and Its Effects", in Class, Status, and Power. Bendix, Reinhard and Lipset (eds.), second edition, The Free Press, New York.

National Opinion Research Centre
1946 "National Opinion on Occupations", (summarized in Wilson, L. and W.L. Kobb, Sociological Analysis. Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1949, Ch. 13, New York.)

Nosow, Sigmund and William H. Form (eds.)
1962 Man, Work and Society. Basic Books Inc., New York.

Parsons, Talcott
1968 "Professions", International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences. David L. Sills (ed.), Free Press, Vol. 12, New York.

Pineo, Peter C. and John Porter
1973 "Occupational Prestige in Canada", in Social Stratification: Canada. James Curtis and John Porter (eds.), Prentice-Hall of Canada, Scarborough.

Stern, George C.
1963 "Measuring Noncognitive Variables in Research on Teaching", in Handbook on Research on Teaching. N.L. Gage (ed.), The American Educational Research Association, Rand McNally and Co., Chicago.

Vollmer, Harold H. and D.L. Mills
1966 Professionalization. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

D. OTHER SOURCES

The Alberta Teachers' Association
1972 The Alberta Teaching Force, September, 1971. Unpublished Document, Edmonton: The Alberta Teachers' Association, (August).

Crawford, C.B. and G.A. Ferguson
1969 "A General Method of Rotation For Factor Analysis", McGill University, Montreal.

The Edmonton Journal, May 3, 1972, Sec. I, p. 5, cols. 1-2.

Editorial. The Edmonton Journal, August 23, 1972, p. 4M.

Flexner, Abraham
1915 "Is Social Work a Profession?", in proceedings of the National Conference on Charities and Correction: Hildmann Printing Co., Chicago.

Frost, B.P.
1967 "Some Personality Conditions of Educational Achievement in Children in the Fourth Class in Junior School", Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of London, London: England.

Hall, Richard H.
1967 "Components of Professionalization". A paper presented at the 1967 Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association. San Francisco, California.

Hyrnyk, Nicholas P.
1966 "Correlates of Professional Role Orientation in Teaching". Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Humphreys, Edward H.
1970 "Interaction and Prestige of Secondary School Teachers in the Province of Ontario", The Ontario Institude for Studies in Education. Toronto, Ontario: (March).

________.
1970 "Interaction and Concept Change of Secondary School Teachers in the Province of Ontario", The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. Toronto, Ontario: (July).

Ingram, Ernest J.
1965 "Member Involvement in The Alberta Teachers' Association", Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Ishak, Rahim
1971 The Role of the Professions in a Changing World. The Report of the Singapore Conference, The Commonwealth Foundation, Marlborough House, London: (Occasional paper XIII, October).

National Education Association, Division of Field Service
1968 "The Yardstick of a Profession", Institutes on Professional and Public Relations, 1938-1947, Washington, D.C.: The Association.

Ratsoy, Eugene W.
1965 "A Comparative and Cross-Sectional Study of Attitudes of Prospective Teachers". Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.

________.
1970 Characteristics and Instructional Practices of Alberta Teachers in 1968-1969. A research study sponsored by The Alberta Advisory Committee on Educational Studies, Edmonton, Alberta.

Worth, Walter H.
1972 A Choice of Futures. Report of the Alberta Commission on Educational Planning. Queen's Printer, Edmonton.

APPENDICES

DOMTAR
BELFAST BOND
50% COTTON

APPENDIX A

PRESTIGE DIFFERENTIALS WITHIN THE ALBERTA TEACHING FORCE: AN INVENTORY OF MEMBER PERCEPTIONS AND ATTITUDES

PRESTIGE DIFFERENTIALS
WITHIN THE
ALBERTA TEACHING FORCE:

An Inventory of Member
Perceptions and Attitudes

TO ALL TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS

Dear Colleague:

This survey is an important part of the research I am conducting in connection with my doctoral program of studies at the University of Alberta. Approval to request your assistance in this regard has been obtained from the Executive Council of The Alberta Teachers' Association. I would be most grateful for your effort in providing the information requested.

The study is an attempt to investigate certain perceptions and attitudes of teacher groups to various problems associated with teachers and the professional organization. These problems are essentially matters of prestige differentials and attitude differences which exist within the teaching profession.

To collect the data required approximately eleven hundred Alberta teachers, selected at random, are being requested to complete and return this questionnaire WITHIN ONE WEEK. You are one of the teachers selected. Please participate. It will take about 20 minutes of your time.

COMPLETE ANONYMITY IS ASSURED. Data will be coded on IBM cards and processed for groups, not individuals, so please reply frankly and honestly to all questions. Do not write your name on any part of the questionnaire.

Part A requests personal background information. Part B asks you to rank professional and personal characteristics on prestige scales and Parts C and D include attitude questions. PLEASE REACT TO EVERY ITEM IN EACH PART.

Follow closely the directions listed for each section. When you have completed Parts A to D of the questionnaire place it in the return addressed stamped envelope provided, seal and mail, if possible, WITHIN ONE WEEK

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

Very sincerely yours,

K.W. Bride

K.W. Bride.

PART A: PERSONAL-EDUCATIONAL DATA

This information is required to enable group comparisons on attitudes and prestige rankings. Please check (✓) the ONE response to each item which gives the correct information about you or your school. PLEASE ANSWER EACH ITEM.

COMPUTER C.C.

1. SEX:

☐ 1. Male 6
☐ 2. Female

2. MARITAL STATUS:

☐ 1. Married
☐ 2. Single 7
☐ 3. Other

3. AGE: (Last Birthday)

☐ 1. Under 25 years 8
☐ 2. 25 - 35 years
☐ 3. 36 - 50 years
☐ 4. 51 - 60 years
☐ 5. Over 60 years

4. TEACHING AND/OR OTHER DUTIES: (Your job assignment during present school year)

☐ 1. Teaching full-time
☐ 2. Teaching part-time (no other school duties)
☐ 3. Teaching at least half-time plus other non-administrative duties
☐ 4. Teaching at least half-time plus administrative duties 9
☐ 5. Teaching less than half-time plus administrative duties
☐ 6. Administrative duties full-time (no teaching)
☐ 7. Specialist not assigned to regular classroom teaching duties (e.g. librarian, counsellor, etc.)

5. PRESENT POSITION IN YOUR SCHOOL: (The one indicating your major assignment)

☐ 1. Regular classroom teacher
☐ 2. Principal
☐ 3. Vice-principal 10
☐ 4. Assistant principal
☐ 5. Department Head or Curricular Associate
☐ 6. Supervisor or Coordinator
☐ 7. Librarian
☐ 8. Counsellor-Psychologist
☐ 9. Other (please specify) ____________________

6. PREPARATION: (Years of teacher education on which your salary is based)

☐ 1. 1 year or less
☐ 2. 1.1 - 1.9 years 11
☐ 3. 2.0 - 2.9 years
☐ 4. 3.0 - 3.9 years
☐ 5. 4.0 - 4.9 years
☐ 6. 5.0 - 5.9 years
☐ 7. 6.0 - 6.9 years
☐ 8. 7 or more years

7. POPULATION OF CENTRE IN WHICH SCHOOL IS LOCATED:

☐ 1. City - over 100,000 12
☐ 2. City - 20,000 - 100,000
☐ 3. City - 5,000 - 20,000
☐ 4. Town or City - 1,000 - 5,000
☐ 5. Other under 1,000

8. TYPE OF SCHOOL UNIT WHICH EMPLOYS YOU:

☐ 1. School Division or County
☐ 2. City Public School District
☐ 3. City R.C. Separate School District 13
☐ 4. Town Public School District
☐ 5. Town R.C. Separate School District
☐ 6. Village or Rural Public School District
☐ 7. Village or Rural Separate School District
☐ 8. Other (please specify) ______________________________

9. GRADE ORGANIZATION OF YOUR SCHOOL: (Give the best approximation)

☐ 1. Grades 1 - 12
☐ 2. Grades 1 - 9 14
☐ 3. Grades 1 - 6
☐ 4. Grades 1 - 10
☐ 5. Grades 7 - 12
☐ 6. Grades 7 - 9
☐ 7. Grades 9 - 12
☐ 8. Grades 10 - 12

COMPUTER
C.C.

10. NUMBER OF FULL-TIME TEACHERS ON STAFF: (Include principal and vice-principal(s))

( ) 1. Fewer than 5
( ) 2. 5 - 10
( ) 3. 11 - 20
( ) 4. 21 - 30
( ) 5. 31 - 40
( ) 6. 41 - 50 15
( ) 7. More than 50

11. TOTAL YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE AS OF JUNE 30, 1973: (Include administrative experience)

( ) 1. 1 year
( ) 2. 2 years
( ) 3. 3 years
( ) 4. 4 - 5 years
( ) 5. 6 - 10 years
( ) 6. 11 - 15 years
( ) 7. 16 - 20 years 16
( ) 8. More than 20 years

12. HIGHEST UNIVERSITY DEGREE HELD:

( ) 1. None at present
( ) 2. B.A., B.Sc., B.Ed., or other Baccaulaureate
( ) 3. M.A., M.Sc., M.Ed., or other Masters
( ) 4. D.Ed. or Ph. D.
( ) 5. Other (please specify) ____________ 17

13. MAJOR TEACHING ASSIGNMENT BY LEVEL: (If you teach in two or more levels, check the level of your major assignment)

( ) 1. Non-teaching position
( ) 2. Grades 1 - 3
( ) 3. Grades 4 - 6
( ) 4. Grades 1 - 6
( ) 5. Grades 7 - 9
( ) 6. Grades 1 - 12
( ) 7. Grades 7 - 12 18
( ) 8. Grades 10 - 12

14. FIELD OF SPECIALIZATION: (The ONE subject area for which you consider yourself to be MOST adequately prepared to teach)

( ) 1. Fine Arts
( ) 2. Mathematics-Science
( ) 3. English-Social Studies
( ) 4. Physical Education
( ) 5. Home Economics
( ) 6. Commercial
( ) 7. French-Foreign Languages
( ) 8. Industrial 19
( ) 9. Vocational
( ) 10. Other (specify) ____________

15. How many university courses (or equivalent) have you completed in your MAJOR SUBJECT SPECIALIZATION marked in Question #14?

( ) 1. None
( ) 2. One
( ) 3. Two
( ) 4. Three
( ) 5. Four
( ) 6. Five
( ) 7. Six
( ) 8. Seven 20
( ) 9. Eight or more

16. CHECK THE SOURCE OF YOUR FIRST TEACHING CERTIFICATE:

( ) 1. Province of Alberta
( ) 2. Other Canadian province
( ) 3. United States
( ) 4. England
( ) 5. India
( ) 6. West Indies 21
( ) 7. Other Country

17. Check the POSITION OR POSITIONS that you NOW HOLD or HAVE HELD in The Alberta Teachers' Association.

( ) 1. No ATA office at anytime 22
( ) 2. Local president 23
( ) 3. Chairman, Professional Development Committee 24
( ) 4. Chairman, Salary Negotiating Committee 25
( ) 5. Member, Provincial Executive Council 26
( ) 6. President, Provincial Association 27
( ) 7. Other official ATA position(s) 28

PART B: INTRA-OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE RATING SCALES - SECTION ONE

In this questionnaire the term PRESTIGE is used to refer to what teachers believe about the worth and value (their evaluation) of a professional or personal characteristic such as position held in the school or university qualifications acquired.

It is possible to think of teacher groups on the basis of selecting one distinctive professional or personal characteristic to describe the membership of a group. For instance, Elementary School principals can be thought of as a special group or teachers under 25 years of age can be placed in a separate category.

Teacher groups classified on the basis of POSITION HELD IN SCHOOL may vary in the amounts of prestige they command from teachers. For each teacher group considered below, indicate the amount of prestige WHICH YOU ATTRIBUTE TO THAT GROUP.

CIRCLE the appropriate number on the 1 to 6 prestige scale at the right of each teacher group to show your personal estimate which may range anywhere from 1 (LOW amount of prestige) to 6, (HIGH amount of prestige). PLEASE REACT TO EVERY ITEM.

TEACHER GROUP CONSIDERED	AMOUNT OF PRESTIGE I ATTRIBUTE TO THE GROUP						COMPUTER C.C.
	LOW		-	-	HIGH		
1. Teachers - Physical Education	1	2	3	4	5	6	31
2. Principals - Elementary School	1	2	3	4	5	6	32
3. Principals - Junior High School	1	2	3	4	5	6	33
4. Counsellors and Psychologists (full-time)	1	2	3	4	5	6	34
5. Teachers - Elementary grades from 1 to 6	1	2	3	4	5	6	35
6. Teachers - Fine Arts subjects	1	2	3	4	5	6	36
7. Principals - Elementary-Junior High School	1	2	3	4	5	6	37
8. Teachers - Commercial subjects	1	2	3	4	5	6	38
9. Principals - Junior-Senior High School	1	2	3	4	5	6	39
10. Teachers - Industrial Arts subjects	1	2	3	4	5	6	40
11. Teachers - Special Education	1	2	3	4	5	6	41
12. Principals - Elementary-Senior High School	1	2	3	4	5	6	42
13. Teachers - Home Economics	1	2	3	4	5	6	43
14. Principals - Senior High School	1	2	3	4	5	6	44
15. Librarians (full-time)	1	2	3	4	5	6	45
16. Teachers - Vocational subjects	1	2	3	4	5	6	46
17. Department Heads or Curricular Associates	1	2	3	4	5	6	47
18. Teachers - Secondary Academic subjects	1	2	3	4	5	6	48
19. Supervisors and Coordinators	1	2	3	4	5	6	49

SECTION TWO

REMEMBER: PRESTIGE refers to what teachers believe about the worth and value (their evaluation) of a professional or personal characteristic such as position held in the school or university qualifications acquired.

To answer this section of the questionnaire think of each teacher group referred to in the following items as that group of teachers whose members possess the ONE personal characteristic selected to describe the group. For each teacher group listed indicate the amount of prestige WHICH YOU ATTRIBUTE TO THAT GROUP. CIRCLE the appropriate number on the 1 to 6 prestige scale at the right of each teacher group listed to show your personal estimate which may range anywhere from 1, (LOW amount of prestige) to 6, (HIGH amount of prestige). PLEASE REACT TO EVERY ITEM.

TEACHER GROUP CONSIDERED	AMOUNT OF PRESTIGE I ATTRIBUTE TO THE GROUP						COMPUTER C.C.
	LOW		-	-	HIGH		
1. How much prestige do you attribute to each of these AGE GROUPS?							
1. Teachers under 25 years old	1	2	3	4	5	6	6
2. Teachers between 25-35 years old	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Teachers between 36-50 years old	1	2	3	4	5	6	8
4. Teachers between 51-60 years old	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
5. Teachers over 60 years old	1	2	3	4	5	6	10
2. How much prestige do you attribute to each of these TEACHING EXPERIENCE GROUPS?							
1. Teachers with less than 3 years experience	1	2	3	4	5	6	11
2. Teachers with 3-5 years experience	1	2	3	4	5	6	12
3. Teachers with 6-10 years experience	1	2	3	4	5	6	13
4. Teachers with 11-15 years experience	1	2	3	4	5	6	14
5. Teachers with 16-20 years experience	1	2	3	4	5	6	15
6. Teachers with over 20 years experience	1	2	3	4	5	6	16
3. How much prestige do you attribute to each of these SEX GROUPS?							
1. Male teachers	1	2	3	4	5	6	17
2. Female teachers	1	2	3	4	5	6	18
4. How much prestige do you attribute to each of these TEACHING LEVEL GROUPS?							
1. Division One teachers (1-3)	1	2	3	4	5	6	19
2. Division Two teachers (4-6)	1	2	3	4	5	6	20
3. Junior High teachers (7-9)	1	2	3	4	5	6	21
4. Senior High teachers (10-12)	1	2	3	4	5	6	22
5. How much prestige do you attribute to each of these TEACHING QUALIFICATIONS GROUPS?							
1. Teachers with less than 3 years of university preparation	1	2	3	4	5	6	23
2. Teachers with a Professional Teaching Certificate	1	2	3	4	5	6	24
3. Teachers with a B.Ed. degree (or equivalent)	1	2	3	4	5	6	25
4. Teachers with two Bachelor degrees (or equivalent)	1	2	3	4	5	6	26
5. Teachers with an M.Ed. degree (or equivalent)	1	2	3	4	5	6	27
6. Teachers with a D.Ed. or Ph.D. degree (or equivalent)	1	2	3	4	5	6	28

TEACHER GROUP CONSIDERED	AMOUNT OF PRESTIGE I ATTRIBUTE TO THE GROUP						COMPUTER C.C.
	LOW		-	-	HIGH		
6. How much prestige do you attribute to each of these PLACE OF PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION GROUPS?							
1. Teachers prepared in Alberta	1	2	3	4	5	6	29
2. Teachers prepared in other Canadian provinces	1	2	3	4	5	6	30
3. Teachers prepared in the United States	1	2	3	4	5	6	31
4. Teachers prepared in England	1	2	3	4	5	6	32
5. Teachers prepared in India	1	2	3	4	5	6	33
6. Teachers prepared in the West Indies	1	2	3	4	5	6	34
7. Teachers prepared in other countries	1	2	3	4	5	6	35
7. How much prestige do you attribute to each of these OFFICIAL ATA OFFICE GROUPS?							
1. Teachers with no service in ATA office	1	2	3	4	5	6	36
2. Teacher-presidents of ATA locals	1	2	3	4	5	6	37
3. Teacher-chairmen of Professional Development Committees	1	2	3	4	5	6	38
4. Teacher-chairmen of Salary Negotiating Committees	1	2	3	4	5	6	39
5. Teacher-members of Provincial Executive Council	1	2	3	4	5	6	40
6. Teacher-presidents of the Provincial Association	1	2	3	4	5	6	41

CHARACTERISTIC CONSIDERED	AMOUNT OF PRESTIGE I ATTRIBUTE TO THE CHARACTERISTIC						
8. How much IMPORTANCE do you attribute to each of the following characteristics in determining the prestige of teachers?							
1. AGE of teacher	1	2	3	4	5	6	42
2. TEACHING QUALIFICATIONS held by teacher	1	2	3	4	5	6	43
3. PLACE OF PREPARATION of teacher	1	2	3	4	5	6	44
4. TEACHING LEVEL of teacher	1	2	3	4	5	6	45
5. SEX of teacher	1	2	3	4	5	6	46
6. ATA OFFICE held by teacher	1	2	3	4	5	6	47
7. TEACHING EXPERIENCE of teacher	1	2	3	4	5	6	48

PART C: TEACHER ATTITUDE INVENTORY

This part of the questionnaire lists ten statements about The Alberta Teachers' Association. Indicate the degree of your personal agreement or disagreement with each statement by CIRCLING the appropriate symbol at the right. PLEASE REACT TO EVERY ITEM.

CIRCLE (AS) - if you strongly agree with the statement.

CIRCLE (A) - if you agree somewhat with the statement.

CIRCLE (U) - if you are undecided.

CIRCLE (D) - if you disagree somewhat with the statement.

CIRCLE (DS) - if you strongly disagree with the statement.

STATEMENT						COMPUTER C.C.
1. The elected officials of my ATA local provide competent leadership	AS	A	U	D	DS	50
2. The Executive Council of the provincial ATA does not spend the funds of the Association wisely	AS	A	U	D	DS	51
3. The programs, activities and services of The Alberta Teachers' Association are improving	AS	A	U	D	DS	52
4. The Alberta Teachers' Association is not sufficiently concerned with matters of real importance to its members	AS	A	U	D	DS	53
5. In general, the employed staff officers of The Alberta Teachers' Association provide very competent service	AS	A	U	D	DS	54
6. I am not satisfied with the opportunity I have to participate in the policy-making and governmental functions of the provincial ATA	AS	A	U	D	DS	55
7. If I had the choice I would belong to The Alberta Teachers' Association	AS	A	U	D	DS	56
8. Most of the criticism of the provincial association by its members is justified	AS	A	U	D	DS	57
9. The Executive Council of the provincial ATA is not providing competent leadership	AS	A	U	D	DS	58
10. The programs and policies of The Alberta Teachers' Association generally meet with my approval and support	AS	A	U	D	DS	59

PART D: ATTITUDE/BEHAVIOR INVENTORY

Please respond to EACH of the following items in the light of your feelings and behavior.

There are five possible responses to each item. If the item corresponds VERY WELL (VW) to your own attitudes and/or behavior, circle that response. If it corresponds WELL (W), POORLY (P), or VERY POORLY (VP), make the appropriate response. The middle category (?) is designed to indicate an essentially neutral opinion about the item. Please answer ALL items in one fashion or another, making sure that you have NO MORE THAN ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH ITEM.

							COMPUTER C.C.
1.	I systematically read the professional journals . . .	VW	W	?	P	VP	61
2.	Other professions are actually more vital to society than mine	VW	W	?	P	VP	62
3.	My fellow professionals have a pretty good idea about each other's competence	VW	W	?	P	VP	63
4.	I make my own decisions in regard to what is to be done in my work	VW	W	?	P	VP	64
5.	I regularly attend professional meetings at the local level.	VW	W	?	P	VP	65
6.	I think that my profession, more than any other, is essential for society	VW	W	?	P	VP	66
7.	A problem in this profession is that no one really knows what his colleagues are doing	VW	W	?	P	VP	67
8.	I don't have much opportunity to exercise my own judgment	VW	W	?	P	VP	68
9.	I believe that the professional organization(s) should be supported	VW	W	?	P	VP	69
10.	The importance of my profession is sometimes over stressed	VW	W	?	P	VP	70
11.	We really have no way of judging each other's competence	VW	W	?	P	VP	71
12.	My own decisions are subject to review	VW	W	?	P	VP	72
13.	The professional organization doesn't really do too much for the average member	VW	W	?	P	VP	73
14.	Some other occupations are actually more important to society than is mine	VW	W	?	P	VP	74
15.	There is not much opportunity to judge how another person does his work	VW	W	?	P	VP	75
16.	I am my own boss in almost every work-related situation	VW	W	?	P	VP	76
17.	Although I would like to, I really don't read the journals too often	VW	W	?	P	VP	77
18.	If ever an occupation is indispensible, it is this one	VW	W	?	P	VP	78
19.	My colleagues pretty well know how well we all do in our work	VW	W	?	P	VP	79
20.	Most of my decisions are reviewed by other people	VW	W	?	P	VP	80

Thank You For Your Cooperation

Please return as soon as possible to:
K.W. BRIDE,
Box 129, Sub. S. 11,
Department of Educational Administration,
University of Alberta,
Edmonton, Alberta.

Use the self-addressed stamped envelope provided

APPENDIX B

STRATIFICATION OF THE ALBERTA TEACHING FORCE: AN INVENTORY OF MEMBER PERCEPTIONS AND ATTITUDES

PILOT STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE

ACCOMPANYING LETTER OF REQUEST TO PARTICIPANTS IN THE PILOT STUDY

STRATIFICATION
OF THE
ALBERTA TEACHING FORCE:

An Inventory of Member
Perceptions and Attitudes

PART A: PERSONAL-EDUCATIONAL DATA

This information is required to enable group comparisons on attitudes and prestige rankings. Please check (✓) the ONE response to each item which gives the correct information about you or your school.

1. SEX:

( ) 1. Male
( ) 2. Female

2. MARITAL STATUS:

( ) 1. Married
( ) 2. Single
( ) 3. Other

3. TEACHING AND/OR OTHER DUTIES: (Your job assignment during the present school year)

( ) 1. Teaching full-time
( ) 2. Teaching part-time (no other school duties)
( ) 3. Teaching at least half-time plus other non-administrative duties
( ) 4. Teaching at least half-time plus administrative duties
( ) 5. Teaching less than half-time plus administrative duties
( ) 6. Administrative duties full-time (no teaching)
( ) 7. Specialist not assigned to a regular classroom (e.g. librarian, counsellor)

4. PRESENT POSITION IN YOUR SCHOOL:

( ) 1. Regular classroom teacher
( ) 2. Principal
( ) 3. Vice-principal
( ) 4. Assistant principal
( ) 5. Department Head
( ) 6. Supervisor or Coordinator
( ) 7. Librarian
( ) 8. Counsellor-Psychologist
( ) 9. Other (please specify) ____________________

5. PREPARATION: (Years of teacher education on which your salary is based)

( ) 1. 1 year or less
( ) 2. 1.1 - 1.9 years
( ) 3. 2.0 - 2.9 years
( ) 4. 3.0 - 3.9 years
( ) 5. 4.0 - 4.9 years
( ) 6. 5.0 - 5.9 years
( ) 7. 6.0 - 6.9 years
( ) 8. 7 or more years

6. POPULATION OF COMMUNITY IN WHICH SCHOOL IS LOCATED:

( ) 1. Over 100,000
( ) 2. 20,000 - 100,000
( ) 3. 5,000 - 20,000
( ) 4. 1,000 - 5,000
( ) 5. Under 1,000
( ) 6. Rural Area

7. TYPE OF SCHOOL UNIT WHICH EMPLOYS YOU:

( ) 1. School Division or County
( ) 2. City Public School District
( ) 3. City R.C. Separate School District
( ) 4. Town Public School District
( ) 5. Town R.C. Separate School District
( ) 6. Village or Rural Public School District
( ) 7. Village or Rural Separate School District
( ) 8. Other (please specify) ______________________________

STRATIFICATION
OF THE
ALBERTA TEACHING FORCE:

An Inventory of Member
Perceptions and Attitudes

TO ALL TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS

Dear Colleague:

This survey is part of a research requirement I am conducting in connection with my doctoral studies in educational administration at the University of Alberta. The study has been approved by the Department of Educational Administration and the Executive Council of The Alberta Teachers' Association.

I am investigating certain perceptions and attitudes of various teacher groups which focus on problems of interest to members and their professional organization. These problems are primarily related to matters associated with prestige differentials and attitudinal differences existing within the teaching profession.

To collect the data required approximately eleven hundred Alberta teachers, selected at random, are being requested to complete and return this questionnaire WITHIN ONE WEEK. You were one of the teachers selected. Please participate. It will take about 20 minutes time.

COMPLETE ANONYMITY IS ASSURED. Data will be coded on IBM cards and processed for groups, not individuals, so please reply frankly and honestly to all questions. Do not write your name on any part of the questionnaire.

Part A requests personal background information. Part B asks you to rank professional and personal characteristics on prestige scales and Part C includes attitude questions.

Follow closely the directions listed for each section. When you have completed Part C, place the questionnaire in the return addressed stamped envelope provided, seal and mail, if possible, WITHIN ONE WEEK.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

Very sincerely yours,

K.W. Bride

K.W. Bride,
Executive Assistant, ATA.

PART A: PERSONAL-EDUCATIONAL DATA

This information is required to enable group comparisons on attitudes and prestige rankings. Please check (✓) the ONE response to each item which gives the correct information about you or your school.

1. SEX:

( ) 1. Male
( ) 2. Female

2. MARITAL STATUS:

( ) 1. Married
( ) 2. Single
( ) 3. Other

3. TEACHING AND/OR OTHER DUTIES: (Your job assignment during the present school year)

( ) 1. Teaching full-time
( ) 2. Teaching part-time (no other school duties)
( ) 3. Teaching at least half-time plus other non-administrative duties
( ) 4. Teaching at least half-time plus administrative duties
( ) 5. Teaching less than half-time plus administrative duties
( ) 6. Administrative duties full-time (no teaching)
( ) 7. Specialist not assigned to a regular classroom (e.g. librarian, counsellor)

4. PRESENT POSITION IN YOUR SCHOOL:

( ) 1. Regular classroom teacher
( ) 2. Principal
( ) 3. Vice-principal
( ) 4. Assistant principal
( ) 5. Department Head
( ) 6. Supervisor or Coordinator
( ) 7. Librarian
( ) 8. Counsellor-Psychologist
( ) 9. Other (please specify) ____________________

5. PREPARATION: (Years of teacher education on which your salary is based)

( ) 1. 1 year or less
( ) 2. 1.1 - 1.9 years
( ) 3. 2.0 - 2.9 years
( ) 4. 3.0 - 3.9 years
( ) 5. 4.0 - 4.9 years
( ) 6. 5.0 - 5.9 years
( ) 7. 6.0 - 6.9 years
( ) 8. 7 or more years

6. POPULATION OF COMMUNITY IN WHICH SCHOOL IS LOCATED:

( ) 1. Over 100,000
( ) 2. 20,000 - 100,000
( ) 3. 5,000 - 20,000
( ) 4. 1,000 - 5,000
( ) 5. Under 1,000
( ) 6. Rural Area

7. TYPE OF SCHOOL UNIT WHICH EMPLOYS YOU:

( ) 1. School Division or County
( ) 2. City Public School District
( ) 3. City R.C. Separate School District
( ) 4. Town Public School District
( ) 5. Town R.C. Separate School District
( ) 6. Village or Rural Public School District
( ) 7. Village or Rural Separate School District
( ) 8. Other (please specify) ______________________________

8. GRADE ORGANIZATION OF YOUR SCHOOL: (Give the best approximation)

( ) 1. Grades 1 - 12
( ) 2. Grades 1 - 9
( ) 3. Grades 1 - 6
( ) 4. Grades 1 - 10
( ) 5. Grades 7 - 12
( ) 6. Grades 7 - 9
( ) 7. Grades 9 - 12
( ) 8. Grades 10 - 12

9. NUMBER OF FULL-TIME TEACHERS ON STAFF: (Include principal and vice-principal(s))

( ) 1. Less than 5
( ) 2. 5 - 10
( ) 3. 11 - 20
( ) 4. 21 - 30
( ) 5. 31 - 40
( ) 6. 41 - 50
( ) 7. Over 50

10. AGE: (Last Birthday)

( ) 1. Under 25 years
( ) 2. 25 - 35 years
( ) 3. 36 - 50 years
( ) 4. 51 - 60 years
( ) 5. Over 60 years

11. TOTAL YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE AS OF JUNE 30, 1973: (Include administrative experience)

( ) 1. 1 year
( ) 2. 2 years
( ) 3. 3 years
( ) 4. 4 - 5 years
( ) 5. 6 - 8 years
( ) 6. 9 - 14 years
( ) 7. 15 - 20 years
( ) 8. 21 years or more

12. DEGREE(S) HELD:

( ) 1. None
( ) 2. B.A.
( ) 3. B.Ed.
( ) 4. M.A.
( ) 5. M.Ed.
( ) 6. Ed.D.
( ) 7. Ph.D.
( ) 8. Other (specify)______________

13. MAJOR TEACHING ASSIGNMENT BY LEVEL: (If you teach EQUAL time in two or more levels, check the level of your major interest)

( ) 1. Non-teaching position
( ) 2. Grades 1 - 3
( ) 3. Grades 4 - 6
( ) 4. Grades 1 - 6
( ) 5. Grades 7 - 9
( ) 6. Grades 1 - 12
( ) 7. Grades 7 - 12
( ) 8. Grades 10 - 12

14. FIELD OF SPECIALIZATION: (The ONE subject area for which you consider yourself to be MOST adequately prepared to teach)

( ) 1. Fine Arts
( ) 2. Mathematics-Science
( ) 3. English-Social Studies
( ) 4. Physical Education
( ) 5. Home Economics
( ) 6. Commercial
( ) 7. French-Foreign Languages
( ) 8. Industrial
( ) 9. Vocational
( ) 10. Other (specify)______________

15. How many university courses (or equivalent) have you completed in your MAJOR SUBJECT SPECIALIZATION marked in Question #14?

( ) 1. None
( ) 2. One
( ) 3. Two
( ) 4. Three
( ) 5. Four
( ) 6. Five
( ) 7. Six
( ) 8. Seven
( ) 9. Eight or more

PART B: INTRA-OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE RATING SCALES

In this questionnaire the term PRESTIGE is used to refer to what teachers believe about the worth and value (their evaluation) of a professional or personal characteristic.

On the basis of professional and personal characteristics it is possible to think of teacher groups. These groups may receive varying amounts of prestige from other teachers depending on the characteristic being considered. For each teacher group listed below, indicate the amount of prestige which you believe that group commands from other teachers. CIRCLE the appropriate number on the 1 to 6 prestige scale at the right of each teacher group to show your estimate which may range anywhere from 1, (LOW amount of prestige) to 6, (HIGH amount of prestige).

SECTION ONE

TEACHER GROUP CONSIDERED (Assume other things equal)	AMOUNT OF PRESTIGE THE GROUP COMMANDS FROM OTHER TEACHERS					
	LOW					HIGH
1. Teachers - Vocational subjects	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Teachers - Elementary grades	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Teachers - Special Education	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Teachers - Secondary Academic subjects	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Teachers - Commercial subjects	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Teachers - Physical Education	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Teachers - Fine Arts subjects	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. Teachers - Industrial Arts subjects	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. Teachers - Home Economics	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. Supervisors or Curricular Associates	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. Principals - Elementary School	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. Principals - Elementary-Junior High School	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. Principals - Elementary-Senior High School	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. Principals - Junior High School	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. Principals - Junior-Senior High School	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. Principals - Senior High School	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. Counsellors and Psychologists (full-time)	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. Librarians (full-time)	1	2	3	4	5	6

SECTION TWO

REMEMBER: PRESTIGE refers to what teachers believe about the worth and value (their evaluation) of a professional or personal characteristic.

In this instance think of each teacher group as a group possessing the particular personal characteristic specified below. For each teacher group described indicate the amount of prestige which you believe that group commands from other teachers. CIRCLE the appropriate number on the 1 to 6 prestige scale at the right of each teacher group to show your estimate which may range anywhere from 1, (LOW amount of prestige) to 6, (HIGH amount of prestige).

TEACHER GROUP CONSIDERED (Assume other things equal)	AMOUNT OF PRESTIGE THE GROUP COMMANDS FROM OTHER TEACHERS					
	LOW					HIGH
1. How much prestige does each teacher group command from other teachers when they evaluate the SEX of teacher?						
1. Male teachers	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Female teachers	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. How much prestige does each teacher group command from other teachers when they evaluate TEACHING LEVEL of teacher?						
1. Elem. Grade teachers (1-3)	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Elem. Grade teachers (4-6)	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Jr. High Grade teachers (7-9)	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Sr. High Grade teachers (10-12)	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. How much prestige does each teacher group command from other teachers when they evaluate TEACHING QUALIFICATIONS of teacher?						
1. Teachers with less than 3 years of university preparation	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Teachers with a Professional Teaching Certificate	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Teachers with a B.Ed. degree (or equivalent)	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Teachers with two Bachelor degrees (or equivalent)	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Teachers with an M.Ed. degree (or equivalent)	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Teachers with a D.Ed. or Ph.D. degree (or equivalent)	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. How much prestige does each teacher group command from other teachers when they evaluate AGE of teacher?						
1. Teachers under 25 years old	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Teachers between 25-35 years old	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Teachers between 36-50 years old	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Teachers between 51-60 years old	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Teachers over 60 years old	1	2	3	4	5	6

TEACHER GROUP CONSIDERED
(Assume other things equal)

AMOUNT OF PRESTIGE THE GROUP
COMMANDS FROM OTHER TEACHERS

5. How much prestige does each teacher group command from other teachers when they evaluate total years TEACHING EXPERIENCE of teacher?

	LOW					HIGH
1. Teachers with less than 3 years experience	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Teachers with 3-5 years experience	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Teachers with 6-10 years experience	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Teachers with 11-15 years experience	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Teachers with 16-20 years experience	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Teachers with over 20 years experience	1	2	3	4	5	6

6. How much prestige does each teacher group command from other teachers when they evaluate PLACE OF PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION of teacher?

1. Teachers trained in Alberta	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Teachers trained in other Canadian provinces	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Teachers trained in the United States	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Teachers trained in England	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Teachers trained in India	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Teachers trained in the West Indies	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Teachers trained in other countries	1	2	3	4	5	6

7. How much prestige does each teacher group command from other teachers when they evaluate official ATA OFFICE of teacher?

1. Teachers with no ATA office	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Teacher-presidents of ATA locals	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Teacher-chairmen of Professional Development Committees	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Teacher-chairmen of Salary Negotiating Committees	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Teacher-members of Provincial Executive Council	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Teacher-presidents of the Provincial Association	1	2	3	4	5	6

PART C: TEACHER ATTITUDE INVENTORY

This part of the questionnaire lists a number of statements about teaching, teachers, and teachers' organizations. Indicate the degree of your personal agreement or disagreement with each statement by CIRCLING the appropriate symbol at the right. Please react to EVERY item.

CIRCLE AS - if you agree strongly with the statement.
CIRCLE A - if you agree somewhat with the statement.
CIRCLE U - if you are undecided.
CIRCLE D - if you disagree somewhat with the statement.
CIRCLE DS - if you disagree strongly with the statement.

STATEMENT

1. Teachers should not have the legal right to strike . . . AS A U D DS
2. The Alberta Teachers' Association should speak for all teachers on professional matters . . . . AS A U D DS
3. The Alberta Teachers' Association does not exercise enough control over its members . . . . AS A U D DS
4. A major goal of a provincial teachers' association should be to improve the public image of the teaching profession . . . . AS A U D DS
5. Publications produced and distributed by The Alberta Teachers' Association are not a worthwhile investment for the members . . . . AS A U D DS
6. I would encourage as many of my students as possible to enter the teaching profession . . . . AS A U D DS
7. The functions performed by non-professionals in the schools should not be determined and directed by teachers . . . . AS A U D DS
8. The programs, activities and services of The Alberta Teachers' Association are improving . . . . AS A U D DS
9. ATA specialist councils contribute to undesirable divisions within the profession . . . . AS A U D DS
10. If I could have a new opportunity to choose a career, I would certainly not choose teaching . . . . . AS A U D DS
11. A teacher should be willing to serve the provincial association in some responsible way . . . . AS A U D DS
12. Most of the criticism of the provincial association by its members is justified . . . . AS A U D DS
13. Teachers should not have the full rights of collective bargaining in determining their salaries and working conditions . . . . AS A U D DS
14. The elected officials of my ATA local provide competent leadership . . . . AS A U D DS

15. Educational research is not basic to the improvement of educational practice . . . . AS A U D DS

16. The provincial association spends too much time and money in obtaining and maintaining membership on Department of Education and University committees . . . . AS A U D DS

17. I do not regard the present method of evaluating teacher competence as an annoying interference with my professional life . . . . AS A U D DS

18. The maintenance of professional discipline should be the exclusive function of the teaching profession . . . . AS A U D DS

19. I do not feel that I am an integral part of The Alberta Teachers' Association . . . . AS A U D DS

20. In general, the employed staff officers of The Alberta Teachers' Association provide very competent service . . . . AS A U D DS

21. I am unable to apply my specialized training in my position . . . . AS A U D DS

22. Four years of university level study beyond recognized university entrance should be the minimum requirement for initial certification to teach . . . . AS A U D DS

23. A teacher should be a member of at least one ATA specialist council and should take an active part in it . . . . AS A U D DS

24. The evaluation of teacher competency should be the sole responsibility of the profession . . . . . . AS A U D DS

25. The Alberta Teachers' Association is not sufficiently concerned with matters of real importance to its members . . . . AS A U D DS

26. A major responsibility of a professional association should be to assist members to keep up to date with new developments in education . . . . AS A U D DS

27. I am not satisfied with the opportunity I have to participate in the policy-making and governmental functions of the provincial association . . AS A U D DS

28. Community colleges should not be authorized to offer B.Ed. degree courses beyond the first year level . . . . AS A U D DS

29. The provincial teachers' association does a poor job of enforcing the code of ethics for teachers . . . . AS A U D DS

30. Reporting on the work of teachers in his or her school should not be a regular function of the principal . . . . AS A U D DS

31. Professional development programs and activities conducted by the provincial association have increased the status of teaching as a profession . . . . . AS A U D DS

32. Teachers should no longer oppose the "merit pay" principle for determining teachers' salaries . . . . . . AS A U D DS

33. Non-conformist members are given too much freedom by the Association . . . . AS A U D DS

34. A prescribed period of successful internship should not be required prior to granting certification to teach . . . . AS A U D DS

35. Teachers are too preoccupied with increasing the importance of their own particular field of specialization . . . . AS A U D DS

36. All professional educators should be members of one professional organization . . . . AS A U D DS

37. The Executive Council of the provincial association does not spend the funds of the Association wisely . . . . AS A U D DS

38. It is difficult for me to imagine a more satisfactory teaching situation than the one I am in at present . . . . AS A U D DS

39. If I had the choice, I would not belong to The Alberta Teachers' Association . . . . AS A U D DS

40. The formal organization known as The Alberta Teachers' Association is absolutely necessary to direct and coordinate the teachers' drive for higher status . . . . AS A U D DS

41. I do not have a friendly, supportive relationship with my teaching colleagues . . . . AS A U D DS

42. Major responsibility for the certification of teachers should reside with the teaching profession . . . . AS A U D DS

43. The Executive Council of the provincial association is not providing competent leadership . . . . AS A U D DS

44. Compulsory membership in a provincial teachers' organization should not be a requirement for teaching in the publicly supported schools of a province . . . . AS A U D DS

45. The programs and policies of The Alberta Teachers' Association generally meet with my approval and support . . . . AS A U D DS

Indicate YOUR PERSONAL FEELINGS about statements 46 and 47 by placing a check (✓) beside the ONE most appropriate response for each statement.

46. Considering the kind of work I do and my qualifications, compared to other teachers in similar positions --
   - ( ) I get MUCH MORE recognition
   - ( ) I get MORE recognition
   - ( ) I get the SAME recognition
   - ( ) I get LESS recognition
   - ( ) I get MUCH LESS recognition

47. Considering the kind of work I do and my qualifications, compared to other teachers in similar positions --
   - ( ) I get MUCH MORE in the form of rewards and promotions
   - ( ) I get MORE in the form of rewards and promotions
   - ( ) I get the SAME rewards and promotions
   - ( ) I get LESS in the form of rewards and promotions
   - ( ) I get MUCH LESS in the form of rewards and promotions

Thank You For Your Cooperation

Please return as soon as possible to:
BARNETT HOUSE,
11010 - 142nd STREET,
EDMONTON, ALBERTA

Use the self-addressed stamped envelope provided

LETTER OF REQUEST TO TEACHERS IN PILOT SAMPLE

Dear Colleague,

The accompanying questionnaire must be field tested in order to determine its suitability for distribution to a large sample of Alberta teachers. Your assistance in this regard will be much appreciated.

It will require about 20 minutes of your time to complete all sections of the questionnaire according to the directions given. Choose the time most convenient to you during the next day or two.

Use the envelope provided to return the questionnaire to your principal. He has consented to collect them for me.

Complete anonymity is assured. Do not write your name on the inventory.

The Alberta Teachers' Association will be provided with a copy of the completed study which will be available to interested members through the ATA library.

A very sincere thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

K.W. Bride

K.W. Bride

PRESTIGE DIFFERENTIALS WITHIN THE ALBERTA TEACHING FORCE:

An Inventory of Member Perceptions and Attitudes

TO ALL TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS

Dear Colleague:

This survey is an integral part of a research project I am conducting with approval from the Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta and the Executive Council of The Alberta Teachers' Association.

The study is an attempt to investigate certain perceptions and attitudes of teacher groups to various problems associated with teachers and their professional organization. These problems are essentially matters of prestige differentials and attitude differences which exist within the teaching profession.

To collect the data required approximately eleven hundred Alberta teachers, selected at random, are being requested to complete and return this questionnaire WITHIN ONE WEEK. You are one of the teachers selected. Please participate. It will take about 20 minutes of your time.

COMPLETE ANONYMITY IS ASSURED. Data will be coded on IBM cards and processed for groups, not individuals, so please reply frankly and honestly to all questions. Do not write your name on any part of the questionnaire.

Part A requests personal background information. Part B asks you to rank professional and personal characteristics on prestige scales and Part C includes attitude questions.

Follow closely the directions listed for each section. When you have completed Part C, place the questionnaire in the return addressed stamped envelope provided, seal and mail, if possible, WITHIN ONE WEEK.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

Very sincerely yours,

K.W. Bride

K.W. Bride,
Executive Assistant, ATA.

PART A: PERSONAL-EDUCATIONAL DATA

This information is required to enable group comparisons on attitudes and prestige rankings. Please check (✓) the ONE response to each item which gives the correct information about you or your school.

1. SEX:

( ) 1. Male
( ) 2. Female

2. MARITAL STATUS:

( ) 1. Married
( ) 2. Single
( ) 3. Other

3. TEACHING AND/OR OTHER DUTIES: (Your job assignment during the present school year)

( ) 1. Teaching full-time
( ) 2. Teaching part-time (no other school duties)
( ) 3. Teaching at least half-time plus other non-administrative duties
( ) 4. Teaching at least half-time plus administrative duties
( ) 5. Teaching less than half-time plus administrative duties
( ) 6. Administrative duties full-time (no teaching)
( ) 7. Specialist not assigned to regular classroom teaching duties (e.g. librarian, counsellor, etc.)

4. PRESENT POSITION IN YOUR SCHOOL: (The one indicating your major assignment)

( ) 1. Regular classroom teacher
( ) 2. Principal
( ) 3. Vice-principal
( ) 4. Assistant principal
( ) 5. Department Head or Curricular Associate
( ) 6. Supervisor or Coordinator
( ) 7. Librarian
( ) 8. Counsellor-Psychologist
( ) 9. Other (please specify) ______________________

5. PREPARATION: (Years of teacher education on which your salary is based)

( ) 1. 1 year or less
( ) 2. 1.1 - 1.9 years
( ) 3. 2.0 - 2.9 years
( ) 4. 3.0 - 3.9 years
( ) 5. 4.0 - 4.9 years
( ) 6. 5.0 - 5.9 years
( ) 7. 6.0 - 6.9 years
( ) 8. 7 or more years

6. POPULATION OF COMMUNITY IN WHICH SCHOOL IS LOCATED:

( ) 1. Over 100,000
( ) 2. 20,000 - 100,000
( ) 3. 5,000 - 20,000
( ) 4. 1,000 - 5,000
( ) 5. Under 1,000
( ) 6. Rural Area

7. TYPE OF SCHOOL UNIT WHICH EMPLOYS YOU:

( ) 1. School Division or County
( ) 2. City Public School District
( ) 3. City R.C. Separate School District
( ) 4. Town Public School District
( ) 5. Town R.C. Separate School District
( ) 6. Village or Rural Public School District
( ) 7. Village or Rural Separate School District
( ) 8. Other (please specify) ______________________

8. GRADE ORGANIZATION OF YOUR SCHOOL: (Give the best approximation)

( ) 1. Grades 1 - 12
( ) 2. Grades 1 - 9
( ) 3. Grades 1 - 6
( ) 4. Grades 1 - 10
( ) 5. Grades 7 - 12
( ) 6. Grades 7 - 9
( ) 7. Grades 9 - 12
( ) 8. Grades 10 - 12

9. NUMBER OF FULL-TIME TEACHERS ON STAFF: (Include principal and vice-principal(s))

( ) 1. Fewer than 5
( ) 2. 5 - 10
( ) 3. 11 - 20
( ) 4. 21 - 30
( ) 5. 31 - 40
( ) 6. 41 - 50
( ) 7. More than 50

10. AGE: (Last birthday)

( ) 1. Under 25 years
( ) 2. 25 - 35 years
( ) 3. 36 - 50 years
( ) 4. 51 - 60 years
( ) 5. Over 60 years

11. TOTAL YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE AS OF JUNE 30, 1973: (Include administrative experience)

( ) 1. 1 year
( ) 2. 2 years
( ) 3. 3 years
( ) 4. 4 - 5 years
( ) 5. 6 - 8 years
( ) 6. 9 - 14 years
( ) 7. 15 - 20 years
( ) 8. 21 years or more

12. DEGREE(S) HELD:

( ) 1. None
( ) 2. B.A.
( ) 3. B.Ed.
( ) 4. M.A.
( ) 5. M.Ed.
( ) 6. Ed.D.
( ) 7. Ph.D.
( ) 8. Other (specify) ____________

13. MAJOR TEACHING ASSIGNMENT BY LEVEL: (If you teach EQUAL time in two or more levels, check the level of your major assignment)

( ) 1. Non-teaching position
( ) 2. Grades 1 - 3
( ) 3. Grades 4 - 6
( ) 4. Grades 1 - 6
( ) 5. Grades 7 - 9
( ) 6. Grades 1 - 12
( ) 7. Grades 7 - 12
( ) 8. Grades 10 - 12

14. FIELD OF SPECIALIZATION: (The ONE subject area for which you consider yourself to be MOST adequately prepared to teach)

( ) 1. Fine Arts
( ) 2. Mathematics-Science
( ) 3. English-Social Studies
( ) 4. Physical Education
( ) 5. Home Economics
( ) 6. Commercial
( ) 7. French-Foreign Languages
( ) 8. Industrial
( ) 9. Vocational
( ) 10. Other (specify) ____________

15. How many university courses (or equivalent) have you completed in your MAJOR SUBJECT SPECIALIZATION marked in Question #14?

( ) 1. None
( ) 2. One
( ) 3. Two
( ) 4. Three
( ) 5. Four
( ) 6. Five
( ) 7. Six
( ) 8. Seven
( ) 9. Eight or more

PART B: INTRA-OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE RATING SCALES

In this questionnaire the term PRESTIGE is used to refer to what teachers believe about the worth and value (their evaluation) of a professional or personal characteristic such as position held in the school or university qualifications acquired.

It is possible to think of teacher groups on the basis of selecting one distinctive professional or personal characteristic to describe the membership of a group. For instance, Elementary school principals can be thought of as a special group or teachers under 25 years of age can be placed in a separate category.

Teacher groups classified on the basis of position held in school may vary in the amounts of prestige they command from the teachers who hold positions different from the one being considered. For each teacher group considered below, indicate the amount of prestige which you believe that group commands from the OTHER teachers who do not belong to it. CIRCLE the appropriate number on the 1 to 6 prestige scale at the right of each teacher group to show your estimate which may range anywhere from 1, (LOW amount of prestige) to 6, (HIGH amount of prestige).

SECTION ONE

TEACHER GROUP CONSIDERED	AMOUNT OF PRESTIGE THE GROUP COMMANDS FROM OTHER TEACHERS					
	LOW					HIGH
1. Teachers - Physical Education	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Principals - Elementary School	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Principals - Junior High School	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Counsellors and Psychologists (full-time)	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Teachers - Elementary grades from 1 to 6	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Teachers - Fine Arts subjects	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Principals - Elementary-Junior High School	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. Teachers - Commercial subjects	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. Principals - Junior-Senior High School	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. Teachers - Industrial Arts subjects	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. Teachers - Special Education	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. Principals - Elementary-Senior High School	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. Teachers - Home Economics	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. Principals - Senior High School	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. Librarians (full-time)	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. Teachers - Vocational subjects	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. Department Heads or Curricular Associates	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. Teachers - Secondary Academic subjects	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. Supervisors or Coordinators	1	2	3	4	5	6

SECTION TWO

REMEMBER: PRESTIGE refers to what teachers believe about the worth and value (their evaluation) of a professional or personal characteristic such as position held in the school or university qualifications acquired.

To answer this section of the questionnaire think of each teacher group referred to in the following items as that group of teachers whose members possess the one personal characteristic selected to describe the group. For each teacher group listed indicate the amount of prestige which you believe that group commands from the OTHER teachers who do not belong to it. CIRCLE the appropriate number on the 1 to 6 prestige scale at the right of each teacher group listed to show your estimate which may range anywhere from 1, (LOW amount of prestige) to 6, (HIGH amount of prestige).

TEACHER GROUP CONSIDERED	AMOUNT OF PRESTIGE THE GROUP COMMANDS FROM OTHER TEACHERS LOW HIGH
1. How much prestige does each teacher group command from other teachers when they consider the prestige value of that group's AGE characteristic?	
1. Teachers under 25 years old	1 2 3 4 5 6
2. Teachers between 25-35 years old	1 2 3 4 5 6
3. Teachers between 36-50 years old	1 2 3 4 5 6
4. Teachers between 51-60 years old	1 2 3 4 5 6
5. Teachers over 60 years old	1 2 3 4 5 6
2. How much prestige does each teacher group command from other teachers when they consider the prestige value of that group's TEACHING EXPERIENCE characteristic?	
1. Teachers with less than 3 years experience	1 2 3 4 5 6
2. Teachers with 3-5 years experience	1 2 3 4 5 6
3. Teachers with 6-10 years experience	1 2 3 4 5 6
4. Teachers with 11-15 years experience	1 2 3 4 5 6
5. Teachers with 16-20 years experience	1 2 3 4 5 6
6. Teachers with over 20 years experience	1 2 3 4 5 6
3. How much prestige does each teacher group command from other teachers when they consider the prestige value of that group's SEX characteristic?	
1. Male teachers	1 2 3 4 5 6
2. Female teachers	1 2 3 4 5 6
4. How much prestige does each teacher group command from other teachers when they consider the prestige value of that group's TEACHING LEVEL characteristic?	
1. Division One teachers (1-3)	1 2 3 4 5 6
2. Division Two teachers (4-6)	1 2 3 4 5 6
3. Junior High teachers (7-9)	1 2 3 4 5 6
4. Senior High teachers (10-12)	1 2 3 4 5 6

TEACHER GROUP CONSIDERED	AMOUNT OF PRESTIGE THE GROUP COMMANDS FROM OTHER TEACHERS
	LOW HIGH

5. How much prestige does each teacher group command from other teachers when they consider the prestige value of that group's TEACHING QUALIFICATIONS characteristic?
   1. Teachers with less than 3 years of university preparation 1 2 3 4 5 6
   2. Teachers with a Professional Teaching Certificate 1 2 3 4 5 6
   3. Teachers with a B.Ed. degree (or equivalent) 1 2 3 4 5 6
   4. Teachers with two Bachelor degrees (or equivalent) 1 2 3 4 5 6
   5. Teachers with an M.Ed. degree (or equivalent) 1 2 3 4 5 6
   6. Teachers with a D.Ed. or Ph.D. degree (or equivalent) 1 2 3 4 5 6

6. How much prestige does each teacher group command from other teachers when they consider the prestige value of that group's PLACE OF PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION characteristic?
   1. Teachers prepared in Alberta 1 2 3 4 5 6
   2. Teachers prepared in other Canadian provinces 1 2 3 4 5 6
   3. Teachers prepared in the United States 1 2 3 4 5 6
   4. Teachers prepared in England 1 2 3 4 5 6
   5. Teachers prepared in India 1 2 3 4 5 6
   6. Teachers prepared in the West Indies 1 2 3 4 5 6
   7. Teachers prepared in other countries 1 2 3 4 5 6

7. How much prestige does each teacher group command from other teachers when they consider the prestige value of that group's OFFICIAL ATA OFFICE characteristic?
   1. Teachers with no ATA office 1 2 3 4 5 6
   2. Teacher-presidents of ATA locals 1 2 3 4 5 6
   3. Teacher-chairmen of Professional Development Committees 1 2 3 4 5 6
   4. Teacher-chairmen of Salary Negotiating Committees 1 2 3 4 5 6
   5. Teacher-members of Provincial Executive Council 1 2 3 4 5 6
   6. Teacher-presidents of the Provincial Association 1 2 3 4 5 6

PART C: TEACHER ATTITUDE INVENTORY

This part of the questionnaire lists a number of statements about teaching, teachers, and teachers' organizations. Indicate the degree of your personal agreement or disagreement with each statement by CIRCLING the appropriate symbol at the right. Please react to EVERY item.

CIRCLE AS - if you strongly agree with the statement.
CIRCLE A - if you agree somewhat with the statement.
CIRCLE U - if you are undecided.
CIRCLE D - if you disagree somewhat with the statement.
CIRCLE DS - if you strongly disagree with the statement.

STATEMENT

1. Teachers should not have the legal right to strike . . . AS A U D DS
2. The Alberta Teachers' Association should speak for all teachers on professional matters . . . . AS A U D DS
3. The Alberta Teachers' Association does not exercise enough control over its members . . . . AS A U D DS
4. A major goal of a provincial teachers' association should be to improve the public image of the teaching profession . . . . AS A U D DS
5. Publications produced and distributed by The Alberta Teachers' Association are a waste of members' money . . . . AS A U D DS
6. I would encourage as many of my students as possible to enter the teaching profession . . . . AS A U D DS
7. The functions performed by non-professionals in the schools should be determined and directed by teachers . . . . AS A U D DS
8. The programs, activities and services of The Alberta Teachers' Association are improving . . . . AS A U D DS
9. ATA specialist councils contribute to undesirable divisions within the profession . . . . AS A U D DS
10. If I could have a new opportunity to choose a career, I would certainly not choose teaching . . . . . . AS A U D DS
11. A teacher should be willing to serve the provincial association in some responsible way . . . . . . AS A U D DS
12. Most of the criticism of the provincial association by its members is justified . . . . AS A U D DS
13. Teachers should have the same rights of collective bargaining as others do in determining their salaries and working conditions . . . . AS A U D DS
14. The elected officials of my ATA local provide competent leadership . . . . AS A U D DS

15. Educational research is basic to the improvement of educational practice . . . . AS A U D DS

16. The provincial association spends too much time and money in obtaining and maintaining membership on Department of Education and University committees . . . . AS A U D DS

17. I regard the present method of having principals and superintendents evaluate teacher competence as an annoying interference with my professional life . . . . AS A U D DS

18. The maintenance of professional discipline should be the exclusive function of the teaching profession . . . . AS A U D DS

19. I feel that I am not an integral part of The Alberta Teachers' Association . . . . AS A U D DS

20. In general, the employed staff officers of The Alberta Teachers' Association provide very competent service . . . . AS A U D DS

21. I am unable to apply my specialized teacher education in my present position . . . . AS A U D DS

22. Four years of university level study beyond recognized university entrance should be the minimum requirement for initial certification to teach . . . . AS A U D DS

23. A teacher should be a member of at least one ATA specialist council and should take an active part in it . . . . AS A U D DS

24. The evaluation of teacher competency should be the sole responsibility of the profession . . . . . . AS A U D DS

25. The Alberta Teachers' Association is not sufficiently concerned with matters of real importance to its members . . . . AS A U D DS

26. A major responsibility of a professional association should be to assist members to keep up to date with new developments in education . . . . AS A U D DS

27. I am not satisfied with the opportunity I have to participate in the policy-making and governmental functions of the provincial ATA . . . . . AS A U D DS

28. Community colleges should not be authorized to offer degree credit courses in education beyond the first year level . . . . AS A U D DS

29. The provincial teachers' association does a poor job of enforcing the code of ethics for teachers . . . . AS A U D DS

30. The school principal should not be required to regularly report on the work of teachers in the school. . . . . AS A U D DS

31. Professional development programs and activities conducted by the provincial association have increased the status of teaching as a profession . . . . . AS A U D DS

32. Teachers should no longer oppose the "merit pay" principle for determining teachers' salaries . . . . . . AS A U D DS

33. Non-conformist members are given too much freedom by the Association . . . . AS A U D DS

34. A prescribed period of successful internship should be required prior to granting certification to teach . . . . AS A U D DS

35. The formal organization known as The Alberta Teachers' Association is absolutely necessary to direct and coordinate the teachers' drive for higher status . . . . AS A U D DS

36. All professional educators should be members of one professional organization . . . . AS A U D DS

37. The Executive Council of the provincial ATA does not spend the funds of the Association wisely . . . . AS A U D DS

38. It is difficult for me to imagine a more satisfactory teaching situation than the one I am in at present . . . . AS A U D DS

39. If I had the choice, I would not belong to The Alberta Teachers' Association . . . . AS A U D DS

40. Teachers are too preoccupied with increasing the importance of their own particular field of specialization . . . . AS A U D DS

41. I do not have a friendly, supportive relationship with my teaching colleagues . . . . AS A U D DS

42. Major responsibility for the certification of teachers should reside with the teaching profession . . . . AS A U D DS

43. The Executive Council of the provincial ATA is not providing competent leadership . . . . AS A U D DS

44. Compulsory membership in a provincial teachers' organization should not be a requirement for teaching in the publicly supported schools of a province . . . . AS A U D DS

45. The programs and policies of The Alberta Teachers' Association generally meet with my approval and support . . . . AS A U D DS

Indicate YOUR PERSONAL FEELINGS about statements 46 and 47 by placing a check (✓) beside the ONE most appropriate response for each statement.

46. Considering the kind of work I do and my qualifications, compared to other teachers in similar positions, in general --

( ) I get MUCH MORE in the form of rewards and promotions
( ) I get MORE in the form of rewards and promotions
( ) I get THE SAME rewards and promotions
( ) I get LESS in the form of rewards and promotions
( ) I get MUCH LESS in the form of rewards and promotions

47. Considering the kind of work I do and my qualifications, compared to other teachers in similar positions, in general --

( ) I get MUCH MORE recognition from professional colleagues
( ) I get MORE recognition from professional colleagues
( ) I get THE SAME recognition from professional colleagues
( ) I get LESS recognition from professional colleagues
( ) I get MUCH LESS recognition from professional colleagues

Thank You For Your Cooperation

Please return as soon as possible to:
K.W. BRIDE,
BARNETT HOUSE,
11010 - 142nd STREET,
EDMONTON, ALBERTA
Use the self-addressed stamped envelope provided

APPENDIX C

NATURE OF THE STUDY SAMPLE

Table 54

Distribution of the Study Sample According to Position Held in School, Experience, Qualifications, Teaching Level, ATA Office Held, Age, Sex and Place of Professional Preparation by Frequencies and Percentages

Characteristic	Category	N		%
Position Held in School	Teacher (Full-time	504		70.8
	Administrator	97		13.6
	Dept. Head-Supervisor	32		4.5
	Librarian	22		3.1
	Counsellor-Psychologist	17		2.4
	Other	40	(712)*	5.6
Teaching Experience	Less than 3 Years	60		8.4
	3-5 Years	153		21.5
	6-10 Years	169		23.8
	11-15 Years	112		15.8
	16-20 Years	86		12.1
	More than 20 Years	131	(711)*	18.4
Teaching Qualifications (Years Univ. Prep.)	Less than 3 Years	129		18.1
	3.0-3.9 Years	80		11.3
	4.0-4.9 Years	295		41.5
	5.0-5.9 Years	124		17.4
	6.0-6.9 Years	68		9.6
	7 or more Years	15	(711)*	2.1
Teaching Level	Division I (1-3)	150		21.2
	Division II (4-6)	177		25.1
	Division III (7-9)	156		22.1
	Division IV (10-12)	182		25.7
	Non-teaching Position	42	(707)*	5.9
Official ATA Office Held	No Office Held	460		64.6
	Office Held	252	(712)*	35.4
Age	Under 25 Years Old	59		8.3
	25-35 Years Old	295		41.5
	36-50 Years Old	231		32.5
	51-60 Years Old	102		14.3
	Over 60 Years Old	24	(711)*	3.4
Sex	Male	320		44.9
	Female	392	(712)*	55.1
Place of Professional Preparation	Alberta	498		70.0
	Other Can. Province	144		20.3
	Other Country	69	(711)*	9.7

* Total for all categories of the characteristic

APPENDIX D

TABLES SUPPLEMENTARY TO CHAPTER VI

RESULTS OF ANOVA TREATMENT AND NEWMAN-KEULS COMPARISONS

Table 55

Results Obtained from One-way ANOVA Treatment of Total Sample Mean Prestige Scores for Each Teaching Experience Characreristic Evaluated

N = 690

Treatment Means	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	3.1681	3.9942	4.5797	4.7174	4.6551	4.4319

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F
Between People	2563.8750	689.	3.72115	
Within People	3386.1875	3450.	0.981503	
Treatments	1214.3125	5.	242.86249	385.2253*
Residual	2171.8750	3445.	.630442	
Total	5950.0625	4139.		

Prob. of F = 0.0 DF = (K-1)/(N-1)(K-1)

Conservative Prob. = 0.0 DF = 1/(N-1)

Unadjusted Reliabilities R1 = 0.31751 RK = 0.73624

Adjusted Reliabilities R1 = 0.44966 RK = 0.83058

* Significant at .05 level or beyond

Table 56

Results Obtained from One-way ANOVA Treatment of Total Sample Mean Prestige Scores for Each Teaching Level Characteristic Evaluated

N = 690

Treatment Means

	1	2	3	4
1	4.5652	4.4522	4.5449	4.7464

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F
Between People	2263.8125	689.	3.285649	
Within People	1125.7500	2070.	0.543840	
Treatments	31.3320	3.	10.444010	19.7253*
Residual	1094.4180	2067.	0.529471	
Total	3389.5625	2759.		

Prob. of F = 0.00000 DF = (K-1)/(N-1)(K-1)

Conservative Prob. = 0.00001 DF = 1/(N-1)

Unadjusted Reliabilities R1 = 0.55760 RK = 0.83448

Adjusted Reliabilities R1 = 0.56548 RK = 0.83885

* Significant at .05 level or beyond

Table 57

Results Obtained from One-way ANOVA Treatment of Total Sample Mean Prestige Scores for Each Teaching Qualification Characteristic Evaluated

N = 690

Treatment Means	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	3.1565	4.0174	4.5000	4.6725	4.8957	4.9435

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F
Between People	2456.0625	689.	3.564676	
Within People	4012.6875	3450.	1.163097	
Treatments	1594.0625	5.	318.81250	454.1047*
Residual	2418.6250	3445.	0.702068	
Total	6468.7500	4139.		

Prob. of F. = 0.0 DF = (K-1)/(N-1)(K-1)

Conservative Prob. = 0.0 DF = 1/(N-1)

Unadjusted Reliabilities R1 = 0.25603 RK = 0.67372

Adjusted Reliabilities R1 = 0.40461 RK = 0.80305

* Significant at .05 level or beyond

Table 58

Results Obtained from One-way ANOVA Treatment of Total Sample Mean Prestige Scores for Each ATA Official Office Held Characteristic Evaluated

N = 690

Treatment Means	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	3.7014	4.2464	4.1652	4.3826	4.3029	4.5116

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F
Between People	3505.9375	689.	5.088442	
Within People	2452.6875	3450.	0.710923	
Treatments	269.6875	5.	53.937500	85.119
Residual	2183.0000	3445.	0.633671	
Total	5958.6250	4139.		

Prob. of F = 0.0 DF = (K-1)/(N-1)(K-1)

Conservative Prob. = 0.00000 DF = 1/(N-1)

Unadjusted Reliabilities R1 = 0.50648 RK = 0.86029

Adjusted Reliabilities R1 = 0.53953 RK = 0.87547

Table 59

Significance of Differences Between Total Sample Mean Prestige Scores (MPS) on Each Category of Each Professional Characteristic*

MPS by Category of Characteristic		MPS by Category of Characteristic					
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Teaching Experience							
Teachers - Less than 3 Yr.	(1)	-	S	S	S	S	S
3-5 Yr.	(2)			S	S	S	S
6-10 Yr.	(3)				S	S	S
11-15 Yr.	(4)					NS	S
16-20 Yr.	(5)						S
Over 20 Yr.	(6)						-
Teaching Level							
Division I (1-3)	(1)	-	S	NS	S		
Division II (4-6)	(2)			S	S		
Junior High (7-9)	(3)				S		
Senior High (10-12)	(4)				-		
Teaching Qual.							
Less than 3 Yr.	(1)	-	S	S	S	S	S
Prof. Certificate	(2)			S	S	S	S
B.Ed. Degree	(3)				S	S	S
Two Bachelor Degrees	(4)					S	S
M.Ed. Degree	(5)						NS
D.Ed. or Ph.D. Degree	(6)						-
ATA Office Held							
No ATA Office	(1)	-	S	S	S	S	S
Presidents ATA Locals	(2)			NS	S	NS	S
Chairmen, PD Committees	(3)				S	S	S
Chairmen, SN Committees	(4)					NS	S
PEC Members	(5)						S
Presidents Provincial Assn.	(6)						-

* Using the Newman-Keuls Multiple Comparison Procedure

S Difference Significant at .05 level or beyond

NS Difference Not Significant at .05 level

Table 60

Results Obtained from One-way ANOVA Treatment of Total Sample Mean Prestige Scores for Each Age Characteristic Evaluated

N = 690

Treatment Means	1	2	3	4	5
1	3.6870	4.5449	4.5667	3.9826	3.2623

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F
Between People	2362.1406	689.	3.428360	
Within People	3043.6016	2760.	1.102753	
Treatments	869.4921	4.	217.37305	275.5518*
Residual	2174.1094	2756.	0.788864	
Total	5405.7422	3449.		

Prob. of F. = 0.0 DF = (K-1)/(N-1)(K-1)

Conservative Prob. = 0.0 DF = 1/(N-1)

Unadjusted Reliabilities R1 = 0.29666 RK = 0.67834

Adjusted Reliabilities R1 = 0.40091 RK = 0.76990

* Significant at the .05 level or beyond

Table 61

Results Obtained from One-way ANOVA Treatment of Total Sample Mean Prestige Scores for Each Sex Characteristic Evaluated

N = 690

Treatment Means	1	2
1	4.6217	4.4478

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F
Between People	1194.3359	689.	1.733433	
Within People	369.00000	690.	0.534782	
Treatments	10.433594	1.	10.433594	20.0486*
Residual	358.56641	689.	0.520415	
Total	1563.3359	1379.		

Prob. of F. = 0.00001 DF = (K-1)/(N-1)(K-1)

Conservative Prob. = 0.00001 DF = 1/(N-1)

Unadjusted Reliabilities R1 = 0.52846 RK = 0.69149

Adjusted Reliabilities R1 = 0.53820 RK = 0.69978

* Significant at the .05 level or beyond

Table 62

Results Obtained from One-way ANOVA Treatment of Total Sample Mean Prestige Scores for Each Place of Professional Preparation Characteristic Evaluated

N = 690

Treatment Means

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	4.6580	4.3319	3.5957	3.8696	2.9029	2.9478	3.1377

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F
Between People	3711.7891	689.	5.387211	
Within People	4876.0000	4140.	1.177777	
Treatments	1962.4141	6.	327.06885	464.0681*
Residual	2913.5859	4134.	0.704786	
Total	8587.7891	4829.		

Prob. of F. = 0.0 DF = (K-1)/(N-1)(K-1)

Conservative Prob. = 0.0 DF = 1/(N-1)

Unadjusted Reliabilities R1 = 0.33800 RK = 0.78138

Adjusted Reliabilities R1 = 0.48694 RK = 0.86917

* Significant at .05 level or beyond

Table 63

Significance of Differences Between Total Sample Mean Prestige Scores (MPS) on Each Category of Each Personal Characteristic*

MPS by Category of Characteristic		MPS by Category of Characteristic (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Age								
Teachers Under 25 Yr. Old	(1)	-	S	S	S	S		
25-35 Yr. Old	(2)			NS	S	S		
36-50 Yr. Old	(3)				S	S		
51-60 Yr. Old	(4)					S		
Over 60 Yr. Old	(5)					-		
Sex								
Male Teachers	(1)	-	S					
Female Teachers	(2)		-					
Place of Professional Preparation								
Teachers Prepared in Alberta	(1)	-	S	S	S	S	S	S
Other Can. Prov.	(2)			S	S	S	S	S
United States	(3)				S	S	S	S
England	(4)					S	S	S
India	(5)						NS	S
West Indies	(6)							S
Other Countries	(7)							-

* Using Newman-Keuls Multiple Comparison Procedure

S Significant at .05 level or beyond

NS Not Significant at the .05 level

Table 64

Summary of Results Obtained Using Two-way ANOVA Method with Repeated Measures on Factor 'B' for Treatment of Subgroup Mean Prestige Scores on Teaching Experience Categories Evaluated

Levels of 'A' = 6
Repeated Measures = 6
Subjects in 'A' = 59, 143, 154, 99, 80, 107

Summary of Analysis of Variance

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Between Subjects	2419.750	641			
'A' Main Effects	7.303	5	1.461	0.385	0.8592009
Subjects within Groups	2413.000	636	3.794		
Within Subjects	3138.187	3210			
'B' Main Effects	1024.695	5	204.939	355.093	0.0000013
'A*B' Interaction	167.636	25	6.705	11.618	0.0000098
'B' X Subjects within Groups	1835.312	3180	0.577		

Table 65

Summary of Results Obtained Using Two-way ANOVA Method with Repeated Measures on Factor 'B' for Treatment of Subgroup Mean Prestige Scores on Official ATA Office Held Categories Evaluated

Levels of 'A' = 2
Repeated Measures = 6
Subjects in 'A' = 423, 219

Summary of Analysis of Variance

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Between Subjects	3239.937	641			
'A' Main Effects	9.476	1	9.476	1.877	0.1711065
Subjects within Groups	3230.437	640	5.048		
Within Subjects	2326.687	3210			
'B' Main Effects	301.905	5	60.381	96.007	0.0000058
'A*B' Interaction	66.933	5	13.387	21.285	0.0000162
'B' X Subjects within Groups	2012.562	3200	0.629		

Table 66

Summary of Results Obtained Using Two-way ANOVA Method with Repeated Measures on Factor 'B' for Treatment of Subgroup Mean Prestige Scores on Teaching Level Categories Evaluated

Levels of 'A' = 2
Repeated Measures = 4
Subjects in 'A' = 319, 323

Summary of Analysis of Variance					
Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Between Subjects	2102.336	641			
'A' Main Effects	25.557	1	25.557	7.876	0.0051718
Subjects within Groups	2076.770	640	3.245		
Within Subjects	1056.250	1926			
'B' Main Effects	30.181	3	10.060	20.327	0.0000151
'A*B' Interaction	75.393	3	25.131	50.777	0.0000073
'B' X Subjects within Groups	950.258	1920	0.495		

Table 67

Summary of Results Obtained Using Two-way ANOVA Method with Repeated Measures on Factor 'B' for Treatment of Subgroup Mean Prestige Scores on Teaching Qualification Categories Evaluated

Levels of 'A' = 4
Repeated Measures = 6
Subjects in 'A' = 201, 277, 101, 63

Summary of Analysis of Variance					
Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Between Subjects	2314.375	641			
'A' Main Effects	56.378	3	18.793	5.265	0.0013773
Subjects within Groups	2277.125	638	3.569		
Within Subjects	3726.500	3210			
'B' Main Effects	1251.197	5	250.239	390.946	0.0000011
'A*B' Interaction	171.618	15	11.441	17.874	0.0000104
'B' X Subjects within Groups	2041.875	3190	0.640		

Table 68

Summary of Results Obtained Using Two-way ANOVA Method
with Repeated Measures on Factor 'B' for Treatment
of Subgroup Mean Prestige Scores on
Age Categories Evaluated

Levels of 'A' = 5
Repeated Measures = 5
Subjects in 'A' = 59, 276, 200, 88, 19

Summary of Analysis of Variance

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Between Subjects	2169.539	641			
'A' Main Effects	5.179	4	1.295	0.382	0.8213673
Subjects within Groups	2157.699	637	3.387		
Within Subjects	2846.402	2568			
'B' Main Effects	275.494	4	68.873	93.787	0.0000051
'A*B' Interaction	131.873	16	8.242	11.223	0.0000072
'B' X Subjects within Groups	1871.148	2548	0.734		

BELL-FAST BOND

Table 69

Summary of Results Obtained Using Two-way ANOVA Method with Repeated Measures on Factor 'B' for Treatment of Subgroup Mean Prestige Scores on Sex of Teacher Categories Evaluated

Levels of 'A' = 2
Repeated Measures = 2
Subjects in 'A' = 285, 357

Summary of Analysis of Variance					
Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Between Subjects	1091.605	641			
'A' Main Effects	0.126	1	0.126	0.074	0.7860802
Subjects within Groups	1091.531	640	1.706		
Within Subjects	352.500	642			
'B' Main Effects	6.863	1	6.863	13.694	0.0002558
'A*B' Interaction	21.764	1	21.764	43.428	0.0000100
'B' X Subjects within Groups	320.734	640	0.501		

Table 70

Summary of Results Obtained Using Two-way ANOVA Method with Repeated Measures on Factor 'B' for Treatment of Subgroup Mean Prestige Scores on Place of Professional Preparation Categories Evaluated

Levels of 'A' = 3
Repeated Measures = 7
Subjects in 'A' = 455, 128, 59

Summary of Analysis of Variance

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Between Subjects	3474.535	641			
'A' Main Effects	83.024	2	41.512	7.764	0.0004833
Subjects within Groups	3416.535	639	5.347		
Within Subjects	4576.859	3852			
'B' Main Effects	714.751	6	119.125	174.433	0.0000008
'A*B' Interaction	137.903	12	11.492	16.827	0.0000182
'B' X Subjects within Groups	2618.352	3834	0.683		

Table 71

Results Obtained from One-way ANOVA Treatment of Total Sample Mean Prestige Scores for Professional and Personal Characteristics

N = 690

Treatment Means	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	3.4667	4.2913	3.7333	3.3464	2.5420	2.4319	4.4609

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F
Between People	4152.4297	689.	6.026747	
Within People	7960.0000	4140.	1.922704	
Treatments	2539.0430	6.	423.17383	322.7107*
Residual	5420.9570	4134.	1.311309	
Total	12112.430	4829.		

Prob. of F = 0.0 DF = (K-1)/(N-1)(K-1)

Conservative Prob. = 0.0 DF = 1/(N-1)

Unadjusted Reliabilities R1 = 0.23368 RK = 0.68097

Adjusted Reliabilities R1 = 0.33937 RK = 0.78242

* Significant at .05 level or beyond

Table 72

Significance of Differences Between Total Sample Mean Prestige Scores (MPS) on Each Professional and Personal Characteristic*

MPS by Characteristic		MPS (1)	by (2)	(3)	Characteristic (4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Age	(1)	-	S	S	S	S	S	S
Teaching Qual.	(2)			S	S	S	S	S
Place of Professional Preparation	(3)				S	S	S	S
Teaching Level	(4)					S	S	S
Sex of Teacher	(5)						NS	S
ATA Office Held	(6)							S
Teaching Experience	(7)							-

* Using Newman-Keuls Multiple Comparison Procedure

S Significant at .05 level or beyond

NS Not Significant at the .05 level